DOCKET

No. 07-212

Title:	Randall Wright, Sheriff, Shawano County, Wisconsin, Petitioner v. Joseph L. Van Patten
Docketed:	August 20, 2007
Lower Ct:	United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit
Case Nos.:	(04-1276)
Decision Date:	June 5, 2007

~~Date~~~	~~~~~~~Proceedings and Orders~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Aug 17 2007	Petition for a writ of certiorari filed. (Response due September 19, 2007)
Aug 28 2007	Waiver of right of respondent Joseph L. Van Patten to respond filed.
Sep 5 2007	DISTRIBUTED for Conference of September 24, 2007.
Sep 17 2007	Response Requested . (Due October 17, 2007)
Oct 17 2007	Brief of respondent Joseph L. Van Patten in opposition filed.
Oct 30 2007	Reply of petitioner Randall Wright, Sheriff, Shawano County, Wisconsin filed. (Distributed)
Oct 31 2007	DISTRIBUTED for Conference of November 20, 2007.
Nov 26 2007	DISTRIBUTED for Conference of November 30, 2007.
Dec 3 2007	DISTRIBUTED for Conference of December 7, 2007.
Dec 28 2007	DISTRIBUTED for Conference of January 4, 2008.
Jan 7 2008	Judgment REVERSED and case REMANDED. Opinion per curiam. (Detached Opinion). Justice Stevens filed an opinion concurring in the judgment. (Detached Opinion)
Feb 8 2008	JUDGMENT ISSUED.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

1 07 - 212 AUG 17 2007

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

RANDALL WRIGHT, Shawano County Sheriff,

Petitioner,

v.

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

J.B. VAN HOLLEN
Attorney General of Wisconsin

CHRISTOPHER G. WREN
Assistant Attorney General
Counsel of Record

Attorneys for Petitioner
Randall Wright

Wisconsin Department of Justice
Post Office Box 7857
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857
(608) 266-7081

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. By reinstating its original decision and opinion unchanged after this Court vacated the decision and remanded it for further consideration in light of *Carey v. Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. 649 (2006), did the Seventh Circuit exceed its authority under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1) by holding that the Wisconsin Court of Appeals rendered a decision "contrary to . . . clearly established Federal law" when the Wisconsin court relied on *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), rather than *United States v. Cronic*, 466 U.S. 648 (1984), to analyze respondent's claim that defense counsel provided ineffective assistance at a no-contest plea hearing by participating via speakerphone rather than by physically appearing in court?

2. Did the Seventh Circuit exceed its authority under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1) when it relied on facts contrary to those found by the Wisconsin state courts and on debatable inferences from the facts?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 2

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS 2

INTRODUCTION 3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 5

A. Wisconsin State Court Proceedings. 5

1. Pre-plea events. 5

2. Plea hearing. 6

3. Sentencing. 7

4. Hearing on Van Patten's plea-withdrawal motion. 7

a. Van Patten's testimony. 8

b. Defense counsel's testimony. 9

c. Wisconsin trial court's ruling. 9

5. Decision of the Wisconsin Court of Appeals. 10

6. Decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court 10

B. Federal Habeas Corpus Proceedings 11

1. Decision of the United States District Court 11

2. Decision of the Seventh Circuit 11

3. Order of the Supreme Court of the United States 13

4. Post-remand Decision of the Seventh Circuit 13

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION 14

I. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT EXCEEDED THE CONGRESSIONALLY IMPOSED LIMITS IN 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) WHEN IT GRANTED HABEAS RELIEF BASED ON ITS VIEW THAT THE WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS' ADJUDICATION "RESULTED IN A DECISION THAT WAS CONTRARY TO . . . CLEARLY ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW." 17

A. This Court Has Not "Clearly Established" That A *Per Se* Violation of The Sixth Amendment Occurs When Defense Counsel Provides Assistance Via Speakerphone At A Plea Proceeding 17

B. The Wisconsin Court of Appeals' Adjudication Of Van Patten's Ineffective-Assistance Claim Did Not "Result[ ] In A Decision That Was Contrary To

. . . Clearly Established Federal Law" Within The Meaning Of The AEDPA.....20

II. BY RELYING ON FACTS CONTRARY TO THOSE FOUND BY THE WISCONSIN TRIAL COURT AND ON FACTS RESTING ON A SET OF DEBATABLE INFERENCES, THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT VIOLATED THE CONGRESSIONALLY IMPOSED LIMITS FOUND IN 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1). 23

CONCLUSION 28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES CITED

Bell v. Cone,
535 U.S. 685 (2002) 9, 18

Carey v. Musladin,
127 S. Ct. 649 (2006) .....i, 3, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20

Early v. Packer,
537 U.S. 3 (2002) 23

Faretta v. California,
422 U.S. 806 (1975) 18

Hill v. Lockhart,
474 U.S. 52 (1985) 4, 9, 15, 19

Kane v. Garcia Espitia,
546 U.S. 9 (2005) 18, 19

Lockyer v. Andrade,
538 U.S. 63 (2003) 19

Mitchell v. Esparza,
540 U.S. 12 (2003) 21, 23

Powell v. Alabama,
287 U.S. 45 (1932) 18

Rice v. Collins,
546 U.S. 333 (2006) 16, 24, 26

State v. Van Patten,
576 N.W.2d 280 (Wis. 1997) 10

Strickland v. Washington,
466 U.S. 668 (1984) ..... *passim*

United States v. Cronic,
466 U.S. 648 (1984) ..... *passim*

Van Patten v. Deppisch,
434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006) 2

Van Patten v. Endicott,
489 F.3d 827 (7th Cir. 2007) 1-2

Williams v. Taylor,
529 U.S. 362 (2000) 20, 21

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION CITED

U.S. Const. Amend. VI 2

STATUTES CITED

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 2

28 U.S.C. § 2254 ..... 2, 11

28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) 14, 17, 21

28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1) .....i, 3, 14, 15

28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1).....i, 3, 14, 16, 23, 24, 27

Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), Pub. L. 104-132, § 104, 110 Stat. 1214, 1219.....2-3

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

RANDALL WRIGHT, Shawano County Sheriff,

Petitioner,

v.

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Randall Wright[1] respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in this case.

OPINIONS BELOW

The post-remand opinion of the Seventh Circuit (App. A1-4) appears in the Federal Reporter as *Van Patten v.*

[1] In the wake of the decision and order of the Seventh Circuit and a further order of the district court, Jeffrey P. Endicott, warden of Redgranite Correctional Institution and the respondent-appellee in the Seventh Circuit, transferred custody of Van Patten to Shawano County Sheriff Randall Wright.

Endicott, 489 F.3d 827 (7th Cir. 2007). The order associated with this Court's judgment (App. A6-7) vacating the Seventh Circuit's original opinion is reported at 127 S. Ct. 1120 (2007). The first opinion of the Seventh Circuit (App. A11-24) appears in the Federal Reporter as *Van Patten v. Deppisch*, 434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006). The decision and order of the district court (App. A25-35) and the magistrate judge's recommendation to the district judge (App. A36-43) are unreported. The decision of the Wisconsin Court of Appeals (App. A46-51) is unreported.

JURISDICTION

The Seventh Circuit entered its judgment on June 5, 2007 (App. A5). Petitioner invokes this Court's jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS

The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides in relevant part:

> In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right . . . to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), Pub. L. 104-132, § 104, 110 Stat. 1214, 1219 (codified at 28 U.S.C. § 2254), provides in relevant part:

> (d) An application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted with respect to any claim that was adjudicated on the merits in State court proceedings unless the adjudication of the claim –

(1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States; or

(2) resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceeding.

(e)(1) In a proceeding instituted by an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court, a determination of a factual issue made by a State court shall be presumed to be correct. The applicant shall have the burden of rebutting the presumption of correctness by clear and convincing evidence.

INTRODUCTION

This case comes to this Court for the second time. *See Schmidt v. Van Patten*, No. 05-1527 (U.S.). On remand, a divided Seventh Circuit panel (unanimous the first time) reinstated without modification the decision this Court vacated for further consideration in light of *Carey v. Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. 649 (2006) (App. A3).

In the AEDPA, Congress strictly constrained the authority of federal courts to grant habeas relief to State prisoners. As pertinent to this case, a federal court can grant the writ only if the State court decision "was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by" this Court. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1). Moreover, when reviewing an application for habeas relief, the federal court must accept as correct "a determination of a factual issue made by a State court" unless the habeas applicant "rebut[s] the presumption of correctness by clear and convincing evidence." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1).

The Seventh Circuit's reinstated decision runs afoul of both limitations, especially in light of *Musladin*. This Court has never declared, even implicitly, that defense counsel's participation by speakerphone in a change-of-plea hearing equates with a complete deprivation of counsel within the meaning of *United States v. Cronic*, 466 U.S. 648 (1984). Rather, in *Hill v. Lockhart*, 474 U.S. 52 (1985), this Court "clearly established" the two-part test of *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), as the standard for deciding ineffective-assistance-of-counsel challenges to guilty or no-contest pleas. In this case, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals relied on *Hill* and *Strickland* when reviewing respondent's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel at the change-of-plea hearing. Relying on the trial court's factual findings showing that defense counsel's conduct did not prejudice respondent in the slightest, the State appellate court affirmed the conviction.

The Seventh Circuit granted habeas relief, asserting that the Wisconsin Court of Appeals' reliance on *Strickland* ran "contrary to" clearly established law. According to the Seventh Circuit, counsel's assistance via speakerphone differs not one whit from a complete lack of counsel, thus bringing respondent's claim within one of *Strickland* exceptions identified in *Cronic*. The court reached that conclusion even though it acknowledged that this Court has never addressed a similar situation (App. A11), and even though none of the *Cronic* exceptions unquestionably applies. The court also reached this conclusion by rejecting the State courts' factual findings and by ruling instead that defense counsel's conduct prejudiced respondent.

The Seventh Circuit's reinstated decision thus presents this Court again with an issue of critical importance to all federal and State courts: will the federal courts abide by the limits Congress has imposed on the issuance of federal habeas corpus relief?

In urging review, petitioner does not condone, recommend, or encourage the practice of defense counsel assisting clients by telephone rather than in person at court proceedings, even in nonadversarial hearings such as the plea hearing in this case. Nor does petitioner ask this Court to condone, recommend, or encourage the practice. Rather, petitioner has only one interest in this case: the proper application of the standards Congress established for federal courts' review of State prisoners' applications for habeas relief and that this Court emphatically enforced in *Musladin*. Perhaps, under similar facts in a direct federal appeal, the Seventh Circuit could have properly reached the same result it reached here. This case, however, arose under the AEDPA, not on direct review. Under the AEDPA, the Seventh Circuit could not reach this result and remain faithful to the congressionally imposed limits.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Wisconsin State Court Proceedings.

1. Pre-plea events.

Van Patten murdered Todd Anderson by firing a bullet into the back of his head (Answer to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Ex. I at 11; *see also id.* at 7-11 (detailed facts about the crime)).[2] The State of Wisconsin charged Van Patten with first-degree intentional homicide (Ex. C at 1). Attorney James Connell represented Van Patten for "the eight or nine months . . . before the [scheduled] trial" (Ex. J at 33). The Shawano County Di-

---

[2] Subsequent citations to exhibits attached to the Answer to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus will take this form: "Ex. ___".

vision of the Menominee/Shawano Circuit Court scheduled the trial to begin on Monday, September 18, 1995 (*id.* at 36).

2. Plea hearing.

On Tuesday, September 12, 1995 — six days before the scheduled starting date of the trial — Van Patten pled "no contest" to a reduced charge of first-degree reckless homicide (Ex. A; Ex. H at 5, 15, 17; Ex. J. at 4).

The plea followed a period of several days during which Connell had "numerous conversations with Mr. Van Patten and with [District Attorney Gary R.] Bruno" (*id.* at 35). One of the earliest conversations with Bruno occurred on Friday, September 8 (Ex. H at 3). A final "lengthy [telephone] conversation" between Connell and Van Patten occurred around noon on September 12 (Ex. J. at 5, 35). At the plea-withdrawal hearing, Van Patten said the conversation lasted more than thirty minutes (*id.* at 6), with "Mr. Connell . . . going through telling me that it would be better for me to take a plea bargain versus going to jury trial, and . . . just discussing some of the evidence and stuff" (*id.* at 5). After the conversation, Connell told Bruno "that we had agreed to accept his latest proposal, and then apparently this plea hearing was set and set in a relatively short period of time from the time of our last conversation" (*id.* at 35). The rapid arrangement of the hearing created a scheduling conflict for Connell (Ex. J at 35-37), who participated in the plea hearing via a speakerphone (Ex. H at 2).

At the plea hearing, the circuit court advised Van Patten that "[i]f you have any trouble understanding any question, take all the time you need to confer with your attorney, and we can perhaps get him on the line in a private place so you can talk to him privately also" (*id.* at 6). Van Patten understood this advice to mean that "if [he] wanted to talk to [his] attorney, if [he] had any questions,

that they would set up a private place for [him] to talk" (Ex. J at 17). Throughout the proceeding, Connell frequently answered questions posed by the trial judge (Ex. H at 3, 4, 5-6, 10, 12, 15-17, 18, 19), including whether Connell could hear Van Patten's answers (*id.* at 12 (Connell answering in the affirmative)). Connell also participated in a free-form discussion at the end of the proceeding (*id.* at 20-22, 24, 25). For his part, Van Patten "hear[d] [Connell] talking on the phone" (Ex. J at 10) and said he did not have any difficulty understanding Connell during the plea hearing (Ex. H at 9). The court accepted and entered Van Patten's no-contest plea (*id.* at 19).

3. Sentencing.

Fifty-five days later — on November 6, 1995 — the circuit court held the sentencing hearing. Connell appeared in person with Van Patten (Ex. I at 1). The prosecutor recited the facts of the crime (*id.* at 7-11) and argued for the maximum term of imprisonment: twenty years for first-degree reckless homicide, and five years for a dangerous-weapon penalty enhancer (*id.* at 14). As he had promised (Ex. J at 11, 24), Connell argued for a ten-year term of imprisonment (Ex. I at 19; Ex. J at 24). The court accepted the prosecutor's recommendation and sentenced Van Patten to twenty-five years in prison (Ex. I at 27).

4. Hearing on Van Patten's plea-withdrawal motion.

Van Patten moved "to withdraw his plea, or in the alternative [for] a sentence modification" (Ex. B at 3; *see also* App. A13). On August 22, 1996, the circuit court held an evidentiary hearing (Ex. J) on Van Patten's motion. Van Patten testified (*id.* at 4-29), as did Connell (*id.* at 30-38) and Thomas W. Johnson (*id.* at 38-41). Van

Patten's lawyer in a case pending in another county on the day of the plea and from whom Van Patten had sought pre-plea advice in this case after speaking with Connell on the day of the plea (*id.* at 9-10, 38-40).

a. Van Patten's testimony.

At the plea-withdrawal hearing, Van Patten asserted two reasons for entering his no-contest plea: Connell's pre-plea assurances that the trial judge would accept Connell's recommendation of a ten-year prison sentence (Ex. J at 11), and Connell's physical absence from the plea hearing (*id.* at 13). Van Patten elaborated by testifying about pre-plea coercion, intimidation, and promises by Connell. Van Patten testified that "I was forced to take a plea bargain. . . . Every time Mr. Connell would see me, he was telling me Mr. Bruno said if I[ ]didn't take his plea bargain he'[d] make sure I would die in prison" (*id.* at 9; *see also id.* at 21 ("always forced"), 22 ("no choice" about what to say at plea hearing), 48 ("forced all the way")). Van Patten said his lawyer's warnings caused him to forgo telling the court about not wanting to enter a no-contest plea: "Mr. Connell told me that if I told the Court that I wasn't satisfied with what he was doing for me, and if I told the Judge how I was being threatened . . . , that the Judge would get mad and he wouldn't allow any lesser included offenses into the trial" (*id.* at 13; *see also id.* at 23 ("not allowed" by Connell to express reservations about plea)). Van Patten said he did not ask to speak privately with Connell "[b]ecause I was forced not to say anything. I was told not to say anything, just answer the questions that I was told" (*id.* at 17). Van Patten said Connell told him that he "would ask for ten years," that "I would probably only do four or five years," and that "he was friends with the judge, . . . and that most likely the judge would go his way" (*id.* at 10-11; *see also id.* at 26).

b. Defense counsel's testimony.

Connell, a criminal-defense lawyer for twenty-two years (*id.* at 30), unequivocally denied forcing a plea on Van Patten (*id.* at 31). He denied that Van Patten had always wanted a jury trial and never wanted a plea (*id.* at 34). Connell said that over many months, he and Van Patten discussed lesser-included offenses and possible plea agreements (*id.* at 33-34). Connell also said that Van Patten had authorized him to talk with the prosecutor about those possibilities (*id.* at 33-34), but "[w]e weren't able to reach an agreement until shortly before the trial" (*id.* at 33). Connell said his telephonic participation at the plea hearing occurred because of both his scheduling conflict "and the fact that everyone wanted to get this matter concluded," in part so numerous "witnesses could be called off" (*id.* at 36). Connell said he did not recall the prosecutor declaring he would ensure Van Patten died in prison if he did not take the plea offer (*id.* at 37).

c. Wisconsin trial court's ruling.

During arguments, Van Patten's postconviction lawyer did not cite *Strickland*, 466 U.S. 668; *Cronic*, 466 U.S. 648; *Hill*, 474 U.S. 52; *Bell v. Cone*, 535 U.S. 685 (2002), or any other case law (Ex. J at 41-43). The prosecutor cited *Strickland* (*id.* at 47).

In an oral ruling (*id.* at 49-52, App. A52-55), the Wisconsin circuit court denied Van Patten's plea-withdrawal motion (App. A55). The court regarded Van Patten's complaint as rooted in buyer's remorse, not ineffective assistance of counsel or lack of understanding (App. A53-55). In light of Van Patten's extensive testimony about Connell's alleged pre-plea intimidation and promises, the court also regarded as inherently contradictory Van Patten's complaint about Connell's telephonic representation: "[I]f his argument is that he was forced by his attor-

ney to do this, an attorney on the phone is certainly less intimidating than one standing right next to him. So that's not consistent at all with what he is trying to tell the Court here. If he thought this attorney was forcing him to do it, it certainly would be easier to say, 'Well, the guy is on the phone, but, Judge, he's making me do it'" (App. A54).

5. Decision of the Wisconsin Court of Appeals.

The Wisconsin Court of Appeals affirmed, determining that the "plea hearing transcript neither indicates any deficiency in the plea colloquy, nor suggests that Van Patten's attorney's participation by telephone interfered in any way with his ability to communicate with his attorney about his plea" (App. A49). The court observed that the trial "court gave Van Patten the opportunity to speak privately with his attorney over the phone if he had questions about the plea, but Van Patten declined" (App. A49). Citing *Hill* as the basis for relying on *Strickland*, the court rejected Van Patten's ineffective-assistance claim and affirmed the judgment of conviction: "We have reviewed the record with due deference to the trial court's findings, and find nothing to support Van Patten's allegation that counsel forced him to plead no contest. The record does not support, nor does Van Patten's appellate brief include, any argument that counsel's performance was deficient or prejudicial" (App. A51).

6. Decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court denied Van Patten's petition for review. *State v. Van Patten*, 576 N.W.2d 280 (Wis. 1997) (table) (Ex. G, App. A44-45). In the petition for review (Ex. E), Van Patten asserted that his trial law-

yer's telephonic assistance violated his Sixth Amendment right to counsel, but he did not cite any federal or Wisconsin case law.

B. Federal Habeas Corpus Proceedings.

Van Patten filed a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for a writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

1. Decision of the United States District Court.

The district judge adopted the magistrate judge's recommendation (App. A35) and denied the petition (App. A35). In the recommendation, the magistrate judge noted that "[t]he transcript of the plea proceeding indicates that Attorney Connell took an active part in the plea proceeding" (App. A42). Like the Wisconsin trial court, the magistrate judge regarded the ineffective-assistance claim as contradictory (App. A40): "According to Van Patten, Connell's appearance by telephone was enough to intimidate him, but not enough to provide meaningful assistance" (App. A40).

Nonetheless, the magistrate judge declared that Connell's telephonic assistance "was effective under Strickland, but ineffective under Cronic" (App. A38-39). The magistrate judge then found the *Cronic* violation harmless "even though it was a violation of Van Patten's Sixth Amendment right to the effective assistance of counsel" (App. A39). The district judge concurred (App. A34).

2. Decision of the Seventh Circuit.

The Seventh Circuit reversed the district court's order and granted Van Patten the habeas relief he sought (App. A11-24). Even though this Court has never established

that telephonic assistance at a change-of-plea hearing qualifies as deficient performance, results in prejudice to a defendant, or creates a structural defect in the proceeding, the Seventh Circuit held that the Wisconsin Court of Appeals' decision required granting Van Patten relief under the AEDPA.

According to the Seventh Circuit, the Wisconsin appellate court rendered a decision "contrary to" clearly established federal law because the court "set[ ] forth the wrong legal framework" when it chose *Strickland* rather than *Cronic* as the applicable precedent (App. A16 n.2). Acknowledging the lack of any factual similarity between Van Patten's circumstances and those underlying *Cronic*, the Seventh Circuit held that the Wisconsin appellate court adopted this erroneous framework by failing to recognize that continuous telephonic assistance of counsel at a plea hearing and an actual or functional denial of counsel at a plea hearing "'may be regarded as "materially indistinguishable"'" from one another "'because their legal implications are clearly the same, notwithstanding that the facts themselves are significantly different'" (App. A16 n.2 (quoted source omitted)).

The Seventh Circuit reached this conclusion by first reconfiguring Van Patten's claim as "not a complaint about his attorney's effectiveness" but as a complaint about "a structural defect in the proceedings" (App. A18-19), with the structural defect consisting of "the physical absence of counsel from a hearing where a defendant gives up his most valuable constitutional rights and admits his guilt to a serious charge" (App. A23). Thus, according to the Seventh Circuit, because *Cronic* deals with structural defects, the Wisconsin appellate court had an obligation to extend *Cronic* to Van Patten's case instead of relying on *Strickland*.

In concluding that telephonic assistance denied Van Patten any counsel at his plea hearing, the Seventh Circuit repudiated both the Wisconsin trial court's factual

finding that Van Patten would have entered his plea even if Connell had stood next to him in court (App. A53-55) and the undisputed fact — conceded by Van Patten (Ex. J at 17) and recognized by the Wisconsin Court of Appeals (App. A49) — that had Van Patten wanted to confer with Connell in private, he could have done so. The Seventh Circuit instead decided that Van Patten would *not* have entered his plea if Connell had appeared in person (App. A13) and that Van Patten could not confer privately with Connell (App. A18).

The Seventh Circuit entered judgment in Van Patten's favor (App. A9-10) and later denied a petition for rehearing and rehearing *en banc* (App. A8).

3. Order of the Supreme Court of the United States.

On January 16, 2007, acting on Schmidt's petition for a writ of certiorari in *Schmidt v. Van Patten*, No. 05-1527, this Court granted the petition, vacated the Seventh Circuit's decision, and remanded for further consideration in light of *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. 649 (App. A6-7).

In *Musladin*, this Court held that under the AEDPA, the Ninth Circuit erred when it took a line of cases in which this Court addressed government-sponsored courtroom practices (e.g., "compell[ing] the defendant to stand trial in prison clothes," *id.* at 653) and extended it to spectators' courtroom conduct (in *Musladin*, some members of the murder victim's family wearing buttons bearing the victim's photo, *id.* at 651). Because of "the lack of holdings from this Court regarding the potentially prejudicial effect of spectators' courtroom conduct of the kind involved here," and because "[n]o holding of this Court required" applying the Court's test for government-sponsored courtroom practices to spectators' courtroom conduct, this Court held that the Ninth Circuit violated the AEDPA when the court declared that the State

court's rejection of Musladin's challenge to the spectators' courtroom conduct "'was contrary to clearly established federal law and constituted an unreasonable application of that law.'" *Id.* at 652.

4. Post-remand Decision of the Seventh Circuit.

On June 5, 2007, the Seventh Circuit, dividing 2-1, reinstated its original decision and opinion unchanged (App. A1-4). The majority declared that "[n]othing in *Musladin* requires that our 2006 opinion be changed" and that "this case does not concern an open constitutional question" (App. A2). The dissenting judge did not equivocate: "The Majority Opinion does not comport with *Musladin*. In *Musladin*, the court instructed lower courts to read 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1) narrowly." (App. A3.) The dissent continued: "*To the best of my knowledge, the United States Supreme Court has never held that an attorney is presumed to be ineffective if he participates in a plea hearing by speaker phone rather than by physical appearance.* No such case has been cited to us and no factual situation of this nature has come to the court's attention. Thus, I do not conclude that the decision of the Wisconsin Court of Appeals was erroneous." (App. A4.)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Seventh Circuit exceeded its authority under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) and (e)(1) when it granted habeas corpus relief in this case. The Seventh Circuit ignored this Court's message in *Musladin*: when a habeas court confronts a lack of holdings by this Court on the legal import of a particular set of facts, the habeas court cannot find federal law "clearly established" within the meaning of section 2254(d)(1) and, therefore, cannot find a State court's decision an unreasonable application of clearly es-

tablished federal law. *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 654. Moreover, unless a "holding of this Court require[s]" a State court to apply a Court-established test to a set of facts, "the state court's decision [is] not contrary to or an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law." *Id.*

Here, this Court has never held that providing legal assistance over the telephone in any context (much less in a nonadversarial proceeding, such as a change-of-plea hearing) qualifies as ineffective assistance within the meaning of *Strickland*. This Court has also never held that providing legal assistance over the telephone in any context (much less in a nonadversarial proceeding, such as a change-of-plea hearing) creates a structural defect within the meaning of *Cronic*. On the other hand, in *Hill*, 474 U.S. 52, this Court explicitly held that *Strickland* applies to claims of ineffective assistance occurring in a change-of-plea hearing.

Despite the lack of holdings from this Court on any claim or set of facts remotely resembling Van Patten's; despite the lack of any holding of this Court requiring the Wisconsin courts to apply *Cronic* rather than *Strickland* to Van Patten's claim; and despite the Wisconsin appellate court's reliance on this Court's decision in *Hill* and the court's consequent application of *Strickland* to Van Patten's ineffective-assistance claim, the Seventh Circuit declared that *Cronic* established the applicable federal law and required granting Van Patten's habeas petition.

In reinstating its original decision unchanged, the Seventh Circuit ignored *Musladin*'s interpretation of the AEDPA and instead substituted its own view, thus flagrantly violating the Congressionally imposed limitations in section 2254(d)(1). Neither *Strickland* nor *Cronic* clearly establishes that a Sixth Amendment violation occurs when defense counsel provides a defendant with assistance via speakerphone at a plea hearing. *Hill*, on the other hand, clearly establishes that a court reviewing a claim of ineffective assistance at a plea hearing must ap-

ply *Strickland*'s two-part test. Consequently, when the Wisconsin Court of Appeals reviewed Van Patten's ineffective-assistance claim under *Strickland*, the court's adjudication resulted in a decision consistent with, *not* contrary to, "clearly established Federal law, as determined by [this] Court." Under the AEDPA and this Court's decision in *Musladin*, the Seventh Circuit could not properly find the Wisconsin appellate court's decision contrary to or an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law.

In addition, the Seventh Circuit granted habeas relief based on factual determinations contrary to those found by the Wisconsin trial court and on debatable inferences and assumptions unsupported by the record developed in the Wisconsin trial court. Under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1), a federal habeas court must presume the correctness of "a determination of a factual issue made by a State court" unless the habeas applicant "rebut[s] the presumption of correctness by clear and convincing evidence." Here, Van Patten never challenged the correctness of the Wisconsin trial court's determination of any factual issue. Moreover, under *Rice v. Collins*, 546 U.S. 333, 342 (2006), a federal court's "use [of] a set of debatable inferences to set aside the [factual] conclusion reached by the state court does not satisfy AEDPA's requirements for granting a writ of habeas corpus." By relying on facts contrary to those found by the Wisconsin trial court, whether explicitly or by necessary implication, and by "us[ing] . . . debatable inferences" as bases for granting habeas relief, the Seventh Circuit far exceeded its authority under the AEDPA.

I. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT EXCEEDED THE CONGRESSIONALLY IMPOSED LIMITS IN 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) WHEN IT GRANTED HABEAS RELIEF BASED ON ITS VIEW THAT THE WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS' ADJUDICATION "RESULTED IN A DECISION THAT WAS CONTRARY TO . . . CLEARLY ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW."

A. This Court Has Not "Clearly Established" That A *Per Se* Violation Of The Sixth Amendment Occurs When Defense Counsel Provides Assistance Via Speakerphone At A Plea Proceeding.

This Court has not clearly established that telephonic assistance of counsel at a change-of-plea hearing either qualifies as deficient performance or creates a structural defect causing a presumptively prejudicial deficiency. In its original (now reinstated) decision, the Seventh Circuit concedes that this Court has not addressed circumstances like those in this case (App. A11 (describing the question presented in this case as "novel")). Moreover, although this Court in *Cronic* identified three circumstances that create prejudice *per se* and thus excuse a defendant from the obligation of proving prejudice under the second part of the two-part *Strickland* test, this Court has not held that any of those *Cronic* exceptions applies to Van Patten's circumstances. Without a clear statement from this Court, the Seventh Circuit lacked authority under the AEDPA to grant habeas relief here, and the court should not have done so. *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 654 ("lack of holdings from this Court regarding the potentially prejudicial effect of spectators' courtroom conduct of the kind involved here" precluded a finding "that the state court 'unreasonabl[y] appli[ed] clearly established

Federal law"); *Kane v. Garcia Espitia*, 546 U.S. 9, 10 (2005) (per curiam) (*Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975), which clearly establishes a criminal defendant's right to self-representation but "says nothing" about *pro se* defendant's pretrial access to law library, does not "clearly establish[ ]" the "right of the *pro se* defendant to have access to a law library").

In *Cronic*, 466 U.S. 648, this Court identified three categories of errors or impediments that create *per se* prejudice. First, and "[m]ost obvious, of course, is the complete denial of counsel." *Id.* at 659. Second, "if counsel entirely fails to subject the prosecution's case to meaningful adversarial testing, then there has been a denial of Sixth Amendment rights that makes the adversary process itself presumptively unreliable." *Id.* Third, "[c]ircumstances . . . may be present on some occasions when although counsel is available to assist the accused during trial, the likelihood that any lawyer, even a fully competent one, could provide effective assistance is so small that a presumption of prejudice is appropriate without inquiry into the actual conduct of the trial." *Id.* at 659-60. This Court illustrated this category by reviewing the egregious trial conditions in *Powell v. Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45 (1932). For the other categories, the Court's examples of structural defects consisted entirely of conduct or circumstances that irredeemably contaminated the adversarial testing of the case against the defendant. *See also Cone*, 535 U.S. at 695-96 (recapitulating *Cronic*'s three categories).

The Seventh Circuit appears to rest its grant of habeas relief on either the first category (complete denial of counsel) or third category (circumstantial denial of counsel); the second category cannot sensibly apply to a nonadversarial proceeding like a plea hearing. *Cronic*, however, "says nothing" — even by implication — about whether a lawyer who provides assistance by speakerphone at a nonadversarial proceeding equates with no

lawyer at all ("complete denial of counsel"). Likewise, *Cronic* "says nothing" — even by implication — about whether providing assistance by speakerphone at a nonadversarial proceeding makes the likelihood of "effective assistance . . . so small that a presumption of prejudice is appropriate."

Within the context of the AEDPA, this Court has not clearly established that speakerphone assistance of counsel fits within a *Cronic* exception. Absent that clear direction from the Court, the Seventh Circuit exceeded its authority under the AEDPA when it granted habeas relief to Van Patten. *See Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 654; *Garcia Espitia*, 546 U.S. at 10; *cf. Lockyer v. Andrade*, 538 U.S. 63, 72-74 (2003) (reversing federal court of appeals and holding State court's decision not "contrary to . . . clearly established Federal law" where State court could reasonably choose from more than one applicable Supreme Court decision and chose one different from the one preferred by the federal court of appeals).

Moreover, this Court has not clearly established that *Cronic* applies at all in the context of a guilty or no-contest plea. *Hill*, 474 U.S. 52, clearly establishes that the two-part *Strickland* test applies to claims grounded in ineffective assistance at a plea hearing. Further, *Hill* clearly defines the specific prejudice a defendant must prove in order to satisfy the *Strickland* test. If anything, *Hill* precludes relieving a defendant of the obligation to prove prejudice when claiming ineffective assistance at a plea hearing and therefore points toward the inapplicability of *Cronic* to that class of ineffective-assistance claims. And none of this Court's other decisions clearly establishes the applicability of *Cronic* to a claim of ineffective assistance at a plea hearing, either.

At this point, this Court has not clearly established under what circumstances a *per se* prejudicial structural defect could arise in a plea hearing, and this Court has certainly never clearly established that ongoing assis-

tance by counsel via speakerphone rather than in person at a plea hearing even amounts to error, much less to a structural defect justifying a finding of prejudice *per se*. Further, in light of *Hill*, the Seventh Circuit could not, consistent with the AEDPA and *Musladin*, hold that the Wisconsin Court of Appeals' reliance on *Strickland* contravened "clearly established Federal law."

B. The Wisconsin Court Of Appeals' Adjudication Of Van Patten's Ineffective-Assistance Claim Did Not "Result[ ] In A Decision That Was Contrary To . . . Clearly Established Federal Law" Within The Meaning Of The AEDPA.

This Court has held that a State court's adjudication of the merits of a habeas applicant's claim does not "result[ ] in a decision . . . contrary to . . . clearly established Federal law" unless the State court either "applies a rule that contradicts the governing law set forth in [this Court's] cases," *Williams v. Taylor*, 529 U.S. 362, 405 (2000), or "confronts a set of facts that are materially indistinguishable from a decision of this Court and nevertheless arrives at a result different from our precedent," *id.* at 406. In *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. 649, this Court further declared that unless a "holding of this Court require[s]" a State court to apply a Court-established test to a set of facts, "the state court's decision [is] not contrary to or an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law." *Id.* at 654. For many of the reasons set forth in Part I.A. (pp. 17-20, above), the Wisconsin Court of Appeals did not commit either error identified in *Williams*. Moreover, for claims of ineffective assistance occurring in a change-of-plea hearing, this Court explicitly required State courts to apply *Strickland*'s two-part test — the test used by the Wisconsin Court of Appeals — and has never

required a State court to apply the *Cronic* exceptions to the *Strickland* two-part test.

This Court has not confronted a case containing facts "materially indistinguishable" from those in this case. The Seventh Circuit acknowledged as much, describing this case as "novel" (App. A11). Consequently, to qualify as a decision "contrary to . . . clearly established Federal law" within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d), the Wisconsin Court of Appeals' decision must have "applie[d] a rule that contradicts the governing law set forth in [this Court's] cases." Under this test, "[a] federal court may not overrule a state court for simply holding a view different from its own, when the precedent from this Court is, at best, ambiguous." *Mitchell v. Esparza*, 540 U.S. 12, 17 (2003). To fit a State court's decision within the boundaries of "contrary to . . . clearly established Federal law" under the AEDPA, a federal habeas court would have to classify the decision "as 'diametrically different' from, 'opposite in character or nature' from, or 'mutually opposed' to . . . [this Court's] clearly established precedent." *Williams*, 529 U.S. at 406. *See also id.* at 405 (adopting dictionary definition of "contrary"). If the State court's decision "does not conflict with the reasoning or the holdings of [the Court's] precedent, it is not 'contrary to . . . clearly established Federal law.'" *Esparza*, 540 U.S. at 17.

The Wisconsin Court of Appeals clearly reached a decision not "opposite in character or nature" from this Court's decisions. Relying on the explicit command of *Hill*, the Wisconsin appellate court cited and applied *Strickland* (App. A50 & n.3) and found that defense counsel's participation via speakerphone had not injured Van Patten in any way. The record also fully supports the Wisconsin court's implicit conclusion that none of the *Cronic* exceptions applied. In short, the record shows counsel's conduct neither unworkable nor detrimental in this case, let alone so problematic it should equate with

having no counsel and therefore qualify as *per se* deficient and prejudicial.

The Seventh Circuit found "structural defects" in the plea proceedings on the grounds that the Wisconsin trial court failed to make "advance arrangements . . . for a private line in a private place" (App. A18) and that private communications between Van Patten and his lawyer "would have required a special request by Van Patten and, apparently, a break in the proceedings" (App. A18). Neither of those circumstances — individually, together, or in combination with other circumstances — justifies finding any error, much less error meriting habeas relief. This Court has also never held that those circumstances create a structural defect.

Neither a structural defect nor other error related to private communications can arise when (as occurred here) the trial court says it will effect private communication and the defendant understands the court will do so; judicial facilitation of private consultation cannot qualify as error, much less as a structural defect. Likewise, the lament that private communications between Van Patten and his lawyer "would have required a special request by Van Patten and, apparently, a break in the proceedings" (App. A18) does not describe a "structural defect" or even distinguish a defendant receiving telephonic assistance from a defendant receiving in-person assistance. Whether assisted by telephone or in person, a defendant who has doubts about his plea decision and wants to discuss it with counsel bears the responsibility for advising counsel or the court (or both) of the need for private consultation. The request, identical in either instance, does not become "special" merely because counsel provides advice by telephone rather than in person. And regardless of whether counsel provides assistance by speakerphone or in person, a private consultation can result in a break in the proceedings. The Seventh Circuit does not identify any decision by this Court even hinting that a break in criminal

proceedings to accommodate a defendant's request for private consultation creates a prejudicial structural defect, and Wright does not know of any, either.

Finally, the Seventh Circuit criticized the Wisconsin Court of Appeals for "never even acknowledg[ing] *Cronic*" (App. A18). In light of *Hill*'s unambiguous declaration that *Strickland* applies to claims of ineffective assistance at a change-of-plea hearing, the Wisconsin appellate court did not have any reason to cite *Cronic*, much less to rely on it. In any event, the Wisconsin court's noncitation of *Cronic* does not subject the decision to the AEDPA's "contrary to" criterion. As this Court has clearly and repeatedly held, "A state court's decision is not 'contrary to . . . clearly established Federal law' simply because the court did not cite our opinions. We have held that a state court need not even be aware of our precedents, 'so long as neither the reasoning nor the result of the state-court decision contradicts them.'" *Esparza*, 540 U.S. at 16 (quoting *Early v. Packer*, 537 U.S. 3, 8 (2002) (per curiam)).[3]

II. BY RELYING ON FACTS CONTRARY TO THOSE FOUND BY THE WISCONSIN TRIAL COURT AND ON FACTS RESTING ON A SET OF DEBATABLE INFERENCES, THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT VIOLATED THE CONGRESSIONALLY IMPOSED LIMITS FOUND IN 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1).

The Seventh Circuit devotes much of its now-reinstated decision to a recitation of facts and circumstances that, in the court's view, should have led the Wis-

---

[3] For the foregoing reasons, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals' decision also did not "involve[ ] an unreasonable application of clearly established Federal law" or unreasonably fail to extend existing precedent.

consin Court of Appeals to apply *Cronic* instead of *Strickland*. The Seventh Circuit's recitation, however, reveals repeated failures to adhere to the limitations found in 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1).

To find *Cronic* rather than *Strickland* applicable, the Seventh Circuit recognized that it had to construe Van Patten's circumstances as akin to those to which *Cronic* would apply: "In deciding whether to dispense with the two-part *Strickland* inquiry, a court must evaluate whether the 'surrounding circumstances make it unlikely that the defendant could have received the effective assistance of counsel,' *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 666, and thus 'justify a presumption that [the] conviction was insufficiently reliable to satisfy the Constitution,' *id.* at 662" (App. A17-18).

The Seventh Circuit answered those questions in the affirmative based on its conclusion that "the arrangements made it impossible for Van Patten to have the 'assistance of counsel' in anything but the most perfunctory sense" (App. A18) and thus amounted to "a structural defect in the proceedings against him" (App. A18-19). In reaching that conclusion, the court ignored both its obligation under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1) to accept as correct the Wisconsin trial court's determinations of factual issues and its obligation under *Collins*, 546 U.S. at 342, not to use "a set of debatable inferences" to undermine a State court's factual determinations.

The Seventh Circuit's fundamentally flawed construction began with its summary of the proceedings in the State trial court (App. A12-13). The court summarized Van Patten's testimony, including Van Patten's claim "that he would not have entered his plea if his attorney had been present at the hearing" (App. A13). The Seventh Circuit then noted that "[t]he court denied Van Patten's postconviction motion" (App. A13).

The Wisconsin trial court, however, in rejecting Van Patten's testimony as not credible, determined that de-

fense counsel did not threaten, coerce, or otherwise bully Van Patten into tendering his no-contest plea and that Van Patten would have entered his plea even if his lawyer had stood next to him during the plea hearing.

Consequently, when the Seventh Circuit wrote that "we cannot know what Van Patten might have done had he been treated like any other defendant with counsel at his side" (App. A19), the court repudiated without warrant the Wisconsin trial court's factual determination, based on testimony from Van Patten and his lawyer, of not only what Van Patten might have done, but what Van Patten certainly would have done: he would have entered the same plea even if — especially if — defense counsel had stood shoulder to shoulder with him.

By crediting the claim that Van Patten would not have tendered his plea if his lawyer had provided assistance in person rather than by speakerphone, the Seventh Circuit flouted the AEDPA's requirement that federal habeas courts must presume the correctness of a State court's factual determinations unless the habeas applicant successfully rebuts the presumption. Van Patten never rebutted the correctness of the Wisconsin trial court's factual determinations.

The Seventh Circuit's deviation from AEDPA standards continued as the court described "all the ways [Van Patten] was foreclosed from receiving an attorney's guidance and support at his hearing," leaving him with only "perfunctory" assistance of counsel (App. A18). Addressing a circumstance the Seventh Circuit regarded as creating a structural defect, the court wrote: "If Van Patten wished to converse with his attorney, anyone else in the courtroom could effectively eavesdrop. (We assume the district attorney would balk if he were expected to conduct last-minute consultations with his staff via speakerphone in open court, 'on the record,' with the defendant taking in every word.)" (App. A18.) This characterization, however, directly contradicts Van Patten's self-admitted

understanding of the circumstances at the plea hearing: Van Patten testified that the trial judge had advised that "if [he] wanted to talk to [his] attorney, if [he] had any questions, that they would set up a private place for [him] to talk" (Ex. J at 17). Without any support in the record, the Seventh Circuit's "fact" does not even rise to the level of a fact based on "a set of debatable inferences," *Collins*, 546 U.S. at 342.

The Seventh Circuit's grant of habeas relief also improperly rested on "a set of debatable inferences," *id.*, about the effect of technology on an attorney's assistance (App. A21-22). As the court's assessment makes clear, the Seventh Circuit does not trust defense attorneys to do their jobs competently and professionally unless "the [trial] court can keep an eye on [them]" (App. A21). The Seventh Circuit's assessment violates *Strickland*'s "clearly established" and frequently reiterated requirement that courts reviewing ineffective-assistance claims presume that counsel provide competent and professional assistance. The plea hearing in this case highlights both the significant departure of the Seventh Circuit from *Strickland*'s presumption of competence and the dubious character of the court's inferences: as the magistrate judge observed in the recommendation adopted by the district judge, "The transcript of the plea proceeding indicates that [defense counsel] took an active part in the plea proceeding" (App. A42).

The Seventh Circuit aggravated its foregoing violations when it painted Van Patten as a defendant bereft and adrift at the plea hearing: "Van Patten stood alone before judge and prosecutor. Unlike the usual defendant in a criminal case, he could not turn to his lawyer for private legal advice, to clear up misunderstandings, to seek reassurance, or to discuss any last-minute misgivings. Listening over an audio connection, counsel could not detect and respond to cues from his client's demeanor that might have indicated he did not understand certain as-

pects of the proceeding, or that he was changing his mind" (App. A18).

This portrait contains a gaping hole, all but indiscernible from the court's opinion but obvious from the plea-withdrawal transcript and the Wisconsin trial judge's oral ruling on Van Patten's claim of ineffective assistance: the irreconcilable conflict between (on one hand) the contention by Van Patten that he would not have entered his plea if his lawyer had assisted him in person rather than by speakerphone and (on the other hand) his repeated assertions that he pleaded because his lawyer made threats and promises before the hearing and forced him to conceal from the trial judge his alleged reservations about the plea. This inherent conflict led the Wisconsin trial court to find as a fact that Van Patten would not have done anything differently if his lawyer had appeared in court — that in light of Van Patten's claims of coercion by counsel, the physical absence of defense counsel afforded Van Patten greater freedom to refuse to tender his plea than he would have possessed had counsel stood next to him. (App. A54.)

A federal habeas court cannot grant habeas relief based on factual findings it makes in violation of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1). Despite the strict limits Congress embedded in section 2254(e)(1), the Seventh Circuit found *per se* prejudice — equating continuous telephonic assistance of counsel at a plea hearing with the actual or functional denial of any counsel at all — by discarding the Wisconsin state courts' findings of facts and by relying on "debatable inferences." The Seventh Circuit's failure to abide by those congressionally imposed limits led to a fundamental violation of the AEDPA.

The Seventh Circuit's recurring disregard for the AEDPA standards for granting habeas relief requires this Court's supervision. The Seventh Circuit rested its rejection of *Strickland* and its application of *Cronic* on facts contrary to those found by the Wisconsin trial court; on

"set[s] of debatable inferences"; on circumstances that neither amount to error nor create any legal or practical distinction between assistance of counsel provided by speakerphone and assistance provided in person; and on the glaring omission of a circumstance critical to determining whether a prejudicial "structural defect" could even exist. Thus, this decision so far exceeds the AEDPA's strict limits on federal courts' review of State criminal convictions as to require an exercise of this Court's supervisory power.

CONCLUSION

This Court should grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

Date: August 17, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

J.B. VAN HOLLEN
Attorney General of Wisconsin

CHRISTOPHER G. WREN
Assistant Attorney General
Counsel of Record

Attorneys for Petitioner
Randall Wright

Wisconsin Department of Justice
Post Office Box 7857
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857
(608) 266-7081
wrencg@doj.state.wi.us

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR APPENDIX

PAGE

Seventh Circuit opinion and decision in *Van Patten v. Endicott*, 489 F.3d 827 (7th Cir. 2007) A1-4

Seventh Circuit judgment in *Van Patten v. Endicott*, 489 F.3d 827 (7th Cir. 2007) A5

Judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States granting petition in *Schmidt v. Van Patten*, No. 05-527, vacating the Seventh Circuit decision, and remanding for further consideration in light of *Carey v. Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. 649 (2006) A6-7

Seventh Circuit order denying petition for rehearing and rehearing *en banc* in *Van Patten v. Deppisch*, 434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006) A8

Seventh Circuit judgment in *Van Patten v. Deppisch*, 434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006) A9-10

Seventh Circuit opinion and decision in *Van Patten v. Deppisch*, 434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006) A11-24

U.S. District Court order denying habeas corpus petition in *Van Patten v. Deppisch*, No. 98-C-1014 (E.D. Wis. Sept. 12, 2003) A25-35

U.S. District Court magistrate judge's recommendation in *Van Patten v. Deppisch*, No. 98-C-1014 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 7, 2003) A36-43

Wisconsin Supreme Court order denying petition for review in *State of Wisconsin v. Joseph L. Van Patten*, 211 Wis. 2d 891, 568 N.W.2d 653 (Ct. App. 1997) (Exhibit G to Answer to Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus) A44-45

Wisconsin Court of Appeals decision in *State of Wisconsin v. Joseph L. Van Patten*, 211 Wis. 2d 891, 568 N.W.2d 653 (Ct. App. 1997) (table) (unpublished opinion) (available on Westlaw at 1997 WL 277952) (Exhibit D to Answer to Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus) A46-51

Wisconsin trial court's oral rulings at plea-withdrawal hearing in *State of Wisconsin v. Joseph L. Van Patten*, No. 94-CF-73 (Pages 49-52 of Exhibit J to Answer to Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus) A52-55

Van Patten v. Endicott, 489 F.3d 827 (7th Cir. 2007)

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit

No. 04-1276

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

JEFFREY P. ENDICOTT,[1]

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.
No. 98 C 1014—**Rudolph T. Randa**, *Chief Judge.*

SUBMITTED MARCH 26, 2007—DECIDED JUNE 5, 2007
PUBLISHED JUNE 29, 2007[2]

Before COFFEY, EVANS, and WILLIAMS, *Circuit Judges.*

[1] Jeffrey P. Endicott is now the correct defendant in this case.

[2] This decision was originally released as an unpublished order. By the court's own motion, it is being reissued as a published opinion.

PER CURIAM. After being convicted in the Wisconsin state courts upon a plea of no contest to a charge of first degree reckless homicide (with a penalty enhancement for committing the offense while using a dangerous weapon), Joseph L. Van Patten was sentenced to a term of 25 years. After exhausting his remedies in state court, Van Patten filed a petition for federal habeas relief (28 U.S.C. § 2254), which the district court denied. On appeal, we granted the petition, holding that the state court proceeding — where his lawyer appeared via speakerphone at the critical hearing when the no contest plea was entered — was, under the circumstances, a violation of Van Patten's right to counsel as analyzed under *United States v. Cronic*, 466 U.S. 648 (1984). Our opinion is reported at *Van Patten v. Deppish*, 434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006).

After a petition for panel rehearing (and for rehearing en banc) was denied, the respondent filed a petition for certiorari. While that petition was pending, the Supreme Court decided *Carey v. Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. 649 (2006), another case addressing a claim under § 2254. The Supreme Court then remanded this case to us for further consideration in light of its new ruling.

Nothing in *Musladin* requires that our 2006 opinion be changed. The petitioner in *Musladin* claimed that his trial was unfair because spectators in the courtroom wore buttons bearing the image of the victim. The Supreme Court held that he was not entitled to relief under § 2254 because there was no "clearly established Federal law" holding that conduct by courtroom spectators deprives a defendant of a fair trial. While the Supreme Court had previously addressed claims based on state-sponsored courtroom practices, the effect of conduct by spectators was "an open question" in the Court's jurisprudence.

Unlike *Musladin*, this case does not concern an open constitutional question. The Supreme Court has long rec-

ognized a defendant's right to relief if his defense counsel was actually or constructively absent at a critical stage of the proceedings. Neither § 2254 nor *Musladin* limits relief to the precise factual situations addressed in the Supreme Court's previous cases. The technology employed in taking Van Patten's no contest plea (the use of a speakerphone) may have been novel, but the legal principle presented by the case was not. Our 2006 opinion and judgment are reinstated.

COFFEY, *Circuit Judge*, dissenting. The United States Supreme Court vacated the prior judgment and remanded this case to this court for further proceedings to determine whether to amend our opinion in view of its decision in *Carey v. Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. 649 (2006). The Majority let stand our opinion in *Van Patten v. Deppisch*, 434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006), *vacated sub nom. Schmidt v. Van Patten*, 127 S. Ct. 1120 (2007).

The Majority Opinion does not comport with *Musladin*. In *Musladin*, the court instructed lower courts to read 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1) narrowly. Section 2254 of Title 28 of the United States Code provides that:

> (d) An application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted with respect to any claim that was adjudicated on the merits in State court proceedings unless the adjudication of the claim —
>
> (1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or an unreasonable application of clearly established Federal Law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States.

28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1).

Lower courts ruling after *Musladin* have heeded this directive and have denied habeas corpus relief in situations in which state courts did not rule contrary to or unreasonably apply clearly established United States Supreme Court holdings (not dicta). *See, e.g., Nguyen v. Garcia*, 477 F.3d 716 (9th Cir. 2007); *Locke v. Cattell*, 476 F.3d 46 (1st Cir. 2007); *Stewart v. Secretary, Department of Corrections*, 476 F.3d 1193 (11th Cir. 2007).

To the best of my knowledge, the United States Supreme Court has never held that an attorney is presumed to be ineffective if he participates in a plea hearing by speaker phone rather than by physical appearance. No such case has been cited to us and no factual situation of this nature has come to the court's attention. Thus, I do not conclude that the decision of the Wisconsin Court of Appeals was erroneous. The Majority has not followed the language in *Musladin* where Justice Thomas, writing for the Court, holds that "given the lack of holdings from this Court regarding the potentially prejudicial effect of spectators' courtroom conduct". . . . "the Court of Appeals improperly concluded that the California Court of Appeal's decision was contrary to or an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law as determined by this Court," *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 654. In Van Patten's case the record reveals no prejudice to the petitioner and the petitioner did not object during the proceedings. Therefore, I respectfully DISSENT from the court's erroneous decision to allow *Van Patten v. Deppisch* to stand as written.

A true Copy:
Teste:

Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit

Chicago, Illinois 60604

JUDGMENT - WITHOUT ORAL ARGUMENT

Date: **June 5, 2007**

BEFORE:
Honorable JOHN L. COFFEY, Circuit Judge
Honorable TERENCE T. EVANS, Circuit Judge Honorable ANN CLAIRE WILLIAMS, Circuit Judge

No. 04-1276

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,
Petitioner- Appellant

v.

JEFFREY P. ENDICOTT,
Respondent- Appellee

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
No. 98 C 1014, Rudolph T. Randa, Chief Judge

ON REMAND FROM THE
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Our 2006 opinion and judgment are reinstated, in accordance with the decision of this court entered on this date.

(1060-110393)

Supreme Court of the United States

No.

05-1527

ROBERT A. SCHMIDT, SHERIFF, SHAWANO COUNTY, WISCONSIN,

Petitioner

v.

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

THIS CAUSE having been submitted on the petition for a writ of certiorari and the response thereto.

ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, it is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the petition for writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment of the above court is vacated with costs, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit for further consideration in light of *Carey v. Musladin*, 549 U.S. ___ (2006).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petitioner Robert A. Schmidt, Sheriff, Shawano County, Wisconsin, recover from Joseph L. Van Patten Three Hundred Dollars ($300.00) for costs herein expended.

January 16, 2007

Clerk's costs: **$300.00**

United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

February 27, 2006

Before

Hon. JOHN L. COFFEY, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. TERENCE T. EVANS, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. ANN CLAIRE WILLIAMS, *Circuit Judge*

No. 04-1276

JOSEPH VAN PATTEN, *Petitioner-Appellant,*	Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
v.	No. 98 CV 1014
JODINE DEPPISCH, *Respondent-Appellee.*	Rudolph T. Randa, *Chief Judge.*

ORDER

On February 6, 2006, the respondent-appellee filed a petition for rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc. All the judges on the original panel have voted to deny a rehearing, and none of the judges in active service have requested a vote on the petition for rehearing en banc.[1] The petitions for rehearing and for rehearing en banc are therefore DENIED.

---

[1] The Honorable Joel M. Flaum and the Honorable Diane S. Sykes did not participate in reviewing the en banc petition in this case.

United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit

Chicago, Illinois 60604

JUDGMENT - WITH ORAL ARGUMENT

Date: **January 24, 2006**

BEFORE:
Honorable JOHN L. COFFEY, Circuit Judge
Honorable TERENCE T. EVANS, Circuit Judge Honorable ANN CLAIRE WILLIAMS, Circuit Judge

No. 04-1276

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,
Petitioner-Appellant

v.

JODINE DEPPISCH,
Respondent-Appellee

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
No. 98 C 1014, Rudolph T. Randa, Chief Judge

The judgment of the District Court is REVERSED and the case is REMANDED for the entry of an order granting the petition for writ of habeas corpus. On the subsequent remand to the Circuit Court for Shawano County, the proceedings against Mr. Van Patten can resume with a plea of not guilty in place. The above is

in accordance with the decision of this court entered on this date.

(1061-110393)

Van Patten v. Deppisch, 434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006)

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit

No. 04-1276

JOSEPH VAN PATTEN,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

JODINE DEPPISCH,

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.
No. 98 CV 1014—**Rudolph T. Randa**, *Chief Judge.*

ARGUED SEPTEMBER 21, 2005—DECIDED JANUARY 24, 2006

Before COFFEY, EVANS, and WILLIAMS, *Circuit Judges.*

EVANS, *Circuit Judge.* Telephone conversations with clients are a big part of what lawyers do. But can using a telephone while representing a client go too far? This habeas case presents the novel — but, in the endless quest for efficiency, perhaps inevitable — question: What does the law require when a client on the other end of a telephone hookup with his lawyer is standing before a judge,

about to relinquish a bevy of important constitutional rights?

Joseph Van Patten was charged with one count of first degree intentional homicide following a fatal shooting in Shawano County, Wisconsin. One day in September 1995, while he was in jail awaiting trial, Van Patten got a call from his attorney, James B. Connell. Connell informed Van Patten that he would shortly be transported to court for a change of plea hearing. Under an oral agreement Connell had reached with the prosecutor, Van Patten was to enter a plea of no contest to a charge of first degree reckless homicide, with a penalty enhancement for committing the offense while using a dangerous weapon. (Van Patten would later testify that he had some questions about the arrangement which he had been unable to raise in the phone call with Connell.)

At the court hearing later that day, Connell "appeared" via speakerphone. Apparently this was due not to any last-minute problem, but simply for the convenience of everyone's schedules. Connell would later explain that he had appearances in two other counties that day; that the court was holding time for Van Patten's trial; that witnesses were waiting to know whether they would be needed; and that "everyone wanted to get this matter concluded." No one asked Van Patten whether he objected to his attorney's absence from the hearing, or whether he would prefer to reschedule the hearing to a time when his attorney could appear in person.

As the participants huddled around a speakerphone on the judge's bench, the judge encouraged Van Patten to "take all the time you need to confer with your attorney, and we can perhaps get him on the line in a private place so you could talk to him privately also." The judge then informed Van Patten that "[e]verything here is going to be on the record." The court quizzed Van Patten to be

sure he understood what was happening at the hearing, including the constitutional guarantees — his rights to a speedy and public trial, to trial by jury, to confront accusers, to compel witnesses, and to not serve as a witness against himself — he was about to forfeit by pleading no contest. Van Patten's only extended comments related to whether he would be allowed a visit in jail from his daughter. Satisfied that everything was in order, the judge accepted the plea. Two months later, Van Patten was sentenced to a maximum term of 25 years in prison.

After retaining different counsel, Van Patten moved to withdraw his plea, arguing that Connell's failure to appear in person at the change of plea hearing violated his Sixth Amendment right to counsel. At the hearing on that motion, Van Patten testified that he had wanted a jury trial but felt "forced" to enter a no-contest plea because Connell told him if he didn't, the prosecutor would "make sure I would die in prison." Asked whether at any point during the hearing he asked to speak to his attorney on a private line, Van Patten said no, because Connell told him to "just say yes and just go along with everything." Van Patten testified that he would not have entered his plea if his attorney had been present at the hearing. The court denied Van Patten's postconviction motion. Claiming that he was denied his right to the assistance of counsel, Van Patten embarked on an odyssey of appellate proceedings.

The Wisconsin Court of Appeals analyzed Van Patten's Sixth Amendment claim as a complaint of ineffective assistance of counsel under *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984). Under *Strickland*, a defendant must show that his counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness. *Id.* at 688. The court's review of the attorney's performance must be "highly deferential [,] . . . indulg[ing] a strong presumption that counsel's conduct falls within the wide range of

reasonable professional assistance." *Id.* at 689. Under *Strickland's* second prong, the defendant also bears the burden of showing prejudice — that is, a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. *Id.* at 694. The state appellate court said its review of the plea hearing transcript "neither indicates any deficiency in the plea colloquy, nor suggests that Van Patten's attorney's participation by telephone interfered in any way with his ability to communicate with his attorney about his plea." Accordingly, the appellate court rejected Van Patten's right-to-counsel claim.[1] The Wisconsin Supreme Court denied further review.

Van Patten then brought his Sixth Amendment claim to the district court as a habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In his recommendation to the district court, the magistrate judge found that Connell's telephonic appearance at the plea hearing had been "effective under *Strickland,*" but "ineffective" under *United States v. Cronic,* 466 U.S. 648 (1984).

Cronic, which was decided on the same day as *Strickland,* recognizes several circumstances where the two-pronged *Strickland* test does not apply, circumstances "so likely to prejudice the accused that the cost of litigating their effect in a particular case is unjustified." *Id.* at 658. *Cronic,* not *Strickland,* applies where there has been a "complete denial of counsel"; where counsel has been "prevented from assisting the accused during a critical stage" of the prosecution; where "counsel entirely fails to subject the prosecution's case to meaningful ad-

---

[1] The state appellate court did acknowledge that Connell's appearance by telephone violated Wis. Stat. § 967.08, which authorizes some proceedings to be conducted by phone but does not permit an attorney to appear by phone at a plea hearing. But the court said this "procedural" violation was "harmless error."

versarial testing"; or under circumstances where "although counsel is available . . . the likelihood that any lawyer, even a fully competent one, could provide effective assistance is so small that a presumption of prejudice is appropriate without inquiry into the actual conduct of the [proceeding]." *Id.* at 659-60 and 659 n.25. *See also Hollenback v. United States,* 987 F.2d 1272, 1275 (7th Cir. 1993) (recognizing *Cronic* as an "exception" to *Strickland*'s two-part test). A *Cronic* violation can occur where the denial of assistance of counsel was either "[a]ctual or constructive." *Strickland,* 466 U.S. at 692. *See also Siverson v. O'Leary,* 764 F.2d 1208, 1217 (7th Cir. 1985). Although he identified *Cronic* as the law governing Van Patten's habeas petition, the magistrate judge believed — and recommended to the district judge (incorrectly, as we will explain) — that the violation could be considered "harmless error."

Acting on the recommendation, the district court made two holdings that are difficult to reconcile. It endorsed the magistrate judge's analysis that counsel's failure to appear in person, albeit "harmless error," was "a violation of Van Patten's Sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel" under *Cronic.* But the district court also concluded that the state appellate court had "properly identified and applied *Strickland,*" rather than *Cronic,* as the appropriate legal framework. (Under *Strickland,* it seems clear Van Patten would have no viable claim.)

Thus, we must resolve two questions: Did the state court err in applying *Strickland,* rather than *Cronic,* when it decided Van Patten's Sixth Amendment claim? If the state court did apply the wrong law and Van Patten was denied assistance of counsel under *Cronic,* did the district court err in applying a harmless-error analysis to defense counsel's failure to appear in person at the plea

hearing? We conclude that the answer to both questions is yes.

Under the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA), a federal court may grant habeas relief from a state court conviction if it finds the state court's adjudication of a constitutional claim "resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1). A state court decision is "contrary to" Supreme Court precedent "if the state court arrives at a conclusion opposite to that reached by [the Supreme] Court on a question of law" or "if the state court confronts facts that are materially indistinguishable from a relevant Supreme Court precedent and arrives at a result opposite to [that of the Supreme Court]." *Williams v. Taylor*, 529 U.S. 362, 405 (2000).[2] We review the district court's decision rejecting

---

[2] The state argues that because the Supreme Court has never decided a case involving counsel's participation in a plea hearing by telephone, the state appellate court's application of *Strickland* to this case did not "result[ ] in a decision that was contrary to . . . clearly established federal law," and thus a federal court may not grant habeas relief. This argument misapprehends the AEDPA regime. "Factual contexts of cases may be regarded as 'materially indistinguishable' because their legal implications are clearly the same, notwithstanding that the facts themselves are significantly different." RANDY HERTZ & JAMES S. LIEBMAN, FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE 1439 n.24 (4th ed. 2001) (citing *Ramdass v. Angelone*, 530 U.S. 156, 180 (O'Connor, J., concurring)). One of the most obvious ways a state court may render a decision "contrary to" the Supreme Court's precedents is when it sets forth the wrong legal framework. *See Williams*, 529 U.S. at 397-98 (state court's decision was contrary to clearly established law because it mischaracterized the appropriate rule for evaluating defendant's Sixth Amendment claim). Moreover, a state court decision is also an "unreasonable application of" Supreme Court precedent if it "refuses to extend [an established legal]

Van Patten's habeas petition *de novo*. *Searcy v. Jaimet*, 332 F.3d 1081, 1087 (7th Cir. 2003).

The Sixth Amendment's right-to-counsel guarantee recognizes "the obvious truth that the average defendant does not have the professional legal skill to protect himself when brought before a tribunal with power to take his life or liberty." *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458, 462-63 (1938). "Of all the rights that an accused person has, the right to be represented by counsel is by far the most pervasive for it affects his ability to assert any other rights he may have." *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 654 (citation omitted). Thus, a defendant requires an attorney's "guiding hand" through every stage of the proceedings against him. *Powell v. Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45, 53 (1932); *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 658. It is well-settled that a court proceeding in which a defendant enters a plea (a guilty plea or, as here, a plea of no contest) is a "critical stage" where an attorney's presence is crucial because "defenses may be . . . irretrievably lost, if not then and there asserted." *Hamilton v. Alabama*, 368 U.S. 52, 54 (1961). *See also White v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 59, 60 (1963); *United States ex rel. Thomas v. O'Leary*, 856 F.2d 1011, 1014 (7th Cir. 1988). Indeed, with plea bargaining the norm and trial the exception, for most criminal defendants a change of plea hearing is *the* critical stage of their prosecution.

In deciding whether to dispense with the two-part *Strickland* inquiry, a court must evaluate whether the "surrounding circumstances make it unlikely that the defendant could have received the effective assistance of counsel," *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 666, and thus "justify a presumption that [the] conviction was insufficiently reliable

---

principle to a new context where it should apply." *Id.* at 407. Thus, if the state court got its decision wrong because it identified and applied the wrong precedent — as we will explain it did in this case — a federal court may award collateral relief.

to satisfy the Constitution," *id.* at 662. In this case, although the transcript shows that the state trial judge did his best to conduct the plea colloquy with care, the arrangements made it impossible for Van Patten to have the "assistance of counsel" in anything but the most perfunctory sense. Van Patten stood alone before judge and prosecutor. Unlike the usual defendant in a criminal case, he could not turn to his lawyer for private legal advice, to clear up misunderstandings, to seek reassurance, or to discuss any last-minute misgivings. Listening over an audio connection, counsel could not detect and respond to cues from his client's demeanor that might have indicated he did not understand certain aspects of the proceeding, or that he was changing his mind. If Van Patten wished to converse with his attorney, anyone else in the courtroom could effectively eavesdrop. (We assume the district attorney would balk if he were expected to conduct last-minute consultations with his staff via speakerphone in open court, "on the record," with the defendant taking in every word.) No advance arrangements had been made for a private line in a private place, and even if one could "perhaps" have been provided, it would have required a special request by Van Patten and, apparently, a break in the proceedings. In short, this was not an auspicious setting for someone about to waive very valuable constitutional rights.

Considering all the ways he was foreclosed from receiving an attorney's guidance and support at his hearing, it is clear to us that Van Patten's case must be resolved under *Cronic*. Thus, the state appellate court arrived at a decision contrary to the Supreme Court's precedent when it analyzed the case under *Strickland* (indeed, the state court's opinion never even acknowledges *Cronic*), and the district court erred when it endorsed that decision. Properly analyzed, Van Patten's claim is not a complaint about his attorney's effectiveness; rather, it points to a structural defect in the pro-

ceedings against him. When a defendant is denied assistance of counsel at a stage where he must assert or lose certain rights and defenses, the error "pervade[s] the entire proceeding." *Satterwhite v. Texas*, 486 U.S. 249 (1988) (citing *White* and *Hamilton*). *See also Bell v. Cone*, 535 U.S. 685, 695-96 (2002) (a trial is "presumptively unfair . . . where the accused is denied the presence of counsel at 'a critical stage'" which holds "significant consequences for the accused") (citations omitted); *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 659 (same).

Van Patten does not allege, for example, that his attorney botched his defense through bad legal judgments, or misinformed him of the ramifications of his plea. Rather, the arrangements under which the hearing was conducted, with defendant and counsel unable to see or communicate privately with each other, prevented Van Patten from receiving the assistance that the Sixth Amendment guarantees. However acceptable an attorney's performance may otherwise be by *Strickland* standards, it is beside the point if the attorney is prevented by the design of the proceeding from providing the full benefit of his skills when his client needs them most. Although the record may make the proceeding appear to have been routine and proper, we cannot know what Van Patten might have done had he been treated like any other defendant with counsel at his side. Under such unique circumstances, a plea cannot meet the constitutional requirement that it be intelligent and voluntary. *See Brady v. United States*, 397 U.S. 742, 749 (1970) (voluntariness of a plea "can be determined only by considering all of the relevant circumstances surrounding it"); *White*, 373 U.S. at 60 (when defendant enters a plea outside the presence of counsel, "we do not stop to determine whether prejudice resulted: 'Only the presence of counsel could have enabled [the] accused to know all the defenses available to him and to plead intelligently.'" (quoting *Hamilton*, 368 U.S. at 55)).

Getting the attorney on speakerphone may have been better than nothing. But the Sixth Amendment requires more than "formal compliance" with its guarantees. *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 654 (citation omitted). *See also Childress v. Johnson*, 103 F.3d 1221, 1231 (5th Cir. 1997) (applying *Cronic* where defense counsel in a plea hearing functioned as little more than "standby counsel"). And so we think it problematic to treat assistance of counsel as a formality to be overcome through creative use of technology so that everyone can keep their calendars in order.

The state argues against applying *Cronic* here because plea hearings do not involve presentation of evidence and, in the state's view, simply formalize bargains previously negotiated by the prosecution and defense. "[D]efense counsel's adversarial-testing role essentially disappears" in a plea hearing, the state reasons in its brief, and thus a telephone appearance is good enough. But the state's conception of counsel's role is too limited.

Defense counsel should be fully engaged at a plea hearing no less than at trial because in both settings, "the accused [is] confronted with both the intricacies of the law and the advocacy of the public prosecutor." *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 654 (quoting *United States v. Ash*, 413 U.S. 300, 309 (1973)). *See also Childress*, 103 F.3d at 1227 ("A defendant is constitutionally entitled to the *active* assistance of counsel at a plea hearing.") (emphasis added). Defense counsel must also ensure that the prosecutor fully performs his end of whatever deal has been struck. *See Santobello v. New York*, 404 U.S. 257, 262 (1971) ("[W]hen a plea rests in any significant degree on a promise or agreement of the prosecutor . . . such promise must be fulfilled.") By the state's logic, if a plea hearing is merely *pro forma*, the state could be represented as effectively by a clerk or paralegal as by one of its professional prosecutors. But however routine such hearings may

have become, the Supreme Court has not revised its view that entering a guilty plea (or its equivalent, as here, a plea of no contest) is "a grave and solemn act," *Brady*, 397 U.S. at 748, to be treated, like all phases of the criminal process, as a "confrontation between adversaries," *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 657.

Physical presence is necessary not only so that counsel can keep an eye on the client and the prosecutor, but so the court can keep an eye on counsel. Even if a private line had been arranged for Van Patten to speak with his attorney, we would regard long-distance lawyering in critical-stage proceedings as inadequate to safeguard effective assistance of counsel and the integrity of the judicial process. This point underscores why *Cronic*, not *Strickland*, applies here.

Over a phone line, it would be all too easy for a lawyer to miss something. For example, she might prejudice her client by failing to make some important point during the proceedings and later claim it was a tactical decision (in which case *Strickland* mandates a large benefit of the doubt), when in reality she wasn't paying attention. Or an attorney might realize he had neglected to inform the client of some crucial piece of information but be tempted to let it pass rather than broadcasting the issue to everyone in the room. *Cf. Ivy v. Caspari*, 173 F.3d 1136 (8th Cir. 1999) (defendant's guilty plea was not knowing and voluntary where counsel had failed to provide adequate explanation of elements of offense and other crucial information). On collateral review, courts can rarely assess an attorney's performance from the printed record alone. Even assuming that counsel could hear and understand every word (and how many people who have experienced speakerphones or conference calls would stake their lib-

erty on *that* assumption?),[3] the client or the judge might never know whether the defense attorney was hanging on every word, reading documents in another case, surfing the web, or falling asleep.[4] *Cf. Burdine v. Johnson*, 262 F.3d 336 (5th Cir. 2001) (en banc), *cert. denied sub nom. Cockrell v. Burdine*, 535 U.S. 1120 (2002) (under *Cronic*, defendant was denied assistance of counsel when his attorney repeatedly dozed during trial).

Having decided that the circumstances surrounding Van Patten's hearing justify a presumption of prejudice under *Cronic*, we must address the district court's finding that defense counsel's constructive absence was nonetheless harmless error.

In his recommendation, the magistrate judge relied on two decisions, *United States v. Morrison*, 946 F.2d 484, 503 (7th Cir. 1991), and *Siverson v. O'Leary*, 764 F.2d 1208 (7th Cir. 1985), where we said counsel's absence in some circumstances might be presumptively prejudicial yet still be subject to a harmless-error analysis. In *Siverson*, a state habeas case, the defendant's counsel was absent when the jury verdict was returned. In *Morrison*, a lengthy multi-defendant federal drug conspiracy trial, the lawyer for one of the defendants was excused (with his client's permission) from attending three court sessions that did not involve the offering of evidence

---

[3] At the plea hearing, the judge instructed the defendant: "Mr. Van Patten, we are going to put your attorney on the speakerphone, so I want you standing up a little closer to make sure he can hear you. I think you will be able to hear him, but sometimes they cannot hear you."

[4] Even if we assume that busy attorneys never do such things during conference calls with their clients, what might we be asked to accept next? Offshore defense-attorney call centers? Letting the defendant confer with counsel via Blackberry?

against the defendant. We viewed these situations as trial errors subject to a harmless-error analysis.

But *Siverson* and *Morrison* also recognized that harmless-error inquiry would not apply where the denial of counsel contaminated the entire proceeding. *See Morrison*, 946 F.2d at 503-04; *Siverson*, 764 F.2d at 1217 n.6. This distinction is underscored by several Supreme Court decisions, which have made clear that while some Sixth Amendment violations are susceptible to harmless-error analysis, *see Arizona v. Fulminante*, 499 U.S. 279, 306-07 (1991) (citing examples), "structural defects" are not, *id.* at 309. *See also Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 88 (1988) (denial of counsel under the meaning of *Cronic* "can never be considered harmless error"); *Satterwhite*, 486 U.S. at 256-57 (explaining the difference between trial error and "violations that pervade the entire proceeding"); *Patrasso v. Nelson*, 121 F.3d 297, 305 (7th Cir. 1997) (remanding for grant of a habeas petition without harmless-error analysis after finding attorney's performance at defendant's sentencing hearing was "so lacking that it invites application of *Cronic* rather than *Strickland*"). Because the physical absence of counsel from a hearing where a defendant gives up his most valuable constitutional rights and admits his guilt to a serious charge is a structural defect, the district court erred in finding that the error could be analyzed under a harmless standard.

Although counsel-by-conference call probably could not have been imagined by the Supreme Court in 1938, it is worth remembering that Justice Sutherland in *Powell* — as well as Justice Stevens in *Cronic* more than a half-century later — invoked the metaphor of the "guiding hand" of counsel which a defendant requires at every step. Similarly, we have observed that "[t]he Sixth Amendment . . . guarantees more than just a warm body to stand next to the accused." *Thomas*, 856 F.2d at 1015. In this case, Van Patten didn't get even a warm body.

The judgment of the district court is REVERSED and the case is REMANDED for the entry of an order granting the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. On the subsequent remand to the Circuit Court for Shawano County, the proceedings against Mr. Van Patten can resume with a plea of not guilty in place.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JOSEPH P. VAN PATTEN,

Petitioner,

-vs- **Case No. 98-C-1014**

THOMAS BORGEN,[1]

Respondent.

DECISION AND ORDER

The petitioner, Joseph P. Van Patten ("Van Patten"), filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On November 6, 1995, Van Patten was convicted of first degree reckless homicide by

---

[1] The respondent, Gary R. McCaughtry ("McCaughtry"), filed a motion to substitute Thomas G. Borgen ("Borgen") as the respondent. As grounds, McCaughtry states that although Van Patten resided in his custody when Van Patten filed the petition, he was transferred to Fox Lake Correctional Institution and now resides in that facility under the custody of Borgen.

Rule 2(a) of the Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Cases Under Section 2254 provides that if an applicant "is presently in custody pursuant to the state judgment in question, the application shall be in the form of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in which the state officer having custody of the applicant shall be named as respondent." Borgen is the State of Wisconsin officer who has custody of the petitioner and accordingly, the Court will grant McCaughtry's motion to substitute Borgen as the respondent and has amended the caption to reflect that substitution.

the State of Wisconsin Circuit Court for Shawno County, Wisconsin. Van Patten is serving a 25-year sentence. He alleges that he was denied effective assistance of counsel in violation of the Sixth Amendment because his counsel did not appear in person at the plea hearing. Relevant to this action is its convoluted procedural history.

Procedural History

Initially, the matter was randomly assigned to United States Magistrate Judge Aaron E. Goodstein. In July 2000, counsel was appointed to represent Van Patten. Appointed counsel filed a traverse on behalf of Van Patten and expanded the grounds for the petition to include the contention that the violation of Wis. Stat § 967.08 at the plea hearing denied Van Patten his right to due process.

On January 17, 2003, Magistrate Aaron E. Goodstein filed an order denying Van Patten's petition for a writ of habeas corpus and directing that the action be dismissed. That same day, the Clerk of Court entered judgment.

On February 6, 2003, Van Patten filed a notice of appeal. On February 19, 2003, Van Patten filed his own motion for extension of time to file a motion for a certificate of appealability (Docket #33). Thereafter, counsel for Van Patten filed a motion for an extension of time to file a certificate of appealability (Docket # 34).

On March 7, 2003, Magistrate Judge Goodstein entered an order vacating the judgment, converting his January 17, 2003, decision and order to a recommendation and directing the Clerk of Court to transfer the matter to a district court judge. On the same date, Magistrate Judge Goodstein also issued a recommendation to the district judge. Thereafter, the Clerk of Court randomly assigned the matter to this Court.

On March 26, 2003, Van Patten filed an answer to order vacating judgment and a request for a C.O.A. [Certificate of Appealability]. Van Patten also submitted several exhibits, including Exhibit A which is various letters and parts of letters. In addition, Van Patten filed a motion for appointment of counsel. (Docket #38).

On June 26, 2003, the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit issued an order dismissing the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. The appellate court noted that Magistrate Judge Goodstein acknowledged his lack of authority to enter final judgment citing the March 7, 2003, order.

On August 5, 2003, Van Patten filed a "supplemental." Van Patten states that he has also provided an exhibit which indicates that the attorney appointed to represent him in this case has been found ineffective by the Office of Lawyer Regulation. Therefore, Van Patten believes that he is entitled to new counsel and that new counsel should have the opportunity to submit the evidence that the ineffective counsel failed to submit.

Analysis

As indicated by the procedural history, there a number of matters to be addressed. Magistrate Judge Goodstein has vacated the January 17, 2003, judgment and converted his decision and order to a recommendation. Therefore, both of Van Patten's February 2003, motions for extension of time relating to a certificate of appealability are moot and will be denied.

With respect to Van Patten's motion for appointment of counsel and the information contained in the August 5, 2003, supplemental, a July 2, 2003, letter from the Supreme Court of Wisconsin's Office of Lawyer Regulation, indicates that the Office of Lawyer Regulation filed a 25-

count disciplinary complaint against the appointed counsel in this case, Elizabeth Cavendish-Sosinski. Some of the allegations of the complaint relate to Van Patten. As outlined in the letter, that matter is in the early stages — Ms. Cavendish-Sosinski had not been served with the complaint as of July 2, 2003, and had various options including defending herself against the charges.

There is no right to counsel in a federal habeas corpus proceeding. *Wright v. West,* 505 U.S. 277, 293 (1992); *Pennsylvania v. Finley,* 481 U.S. 551, 556 (1987). Van Patten has been represented by counsel. Magistrate Judge Goodstein noted that Van Patten had corresponded with the court on multiple occasions concerning the effectiveness of his appointed counsel. Magistrate Goodstein concluded that the traverse submitted by Attorney Cavendish-Sosinski was well-written and presented the "only" feasible arguments in this case. (*Recommendation to District Judge* at 8.) This Court concurs with that conclusion.

Furthermore, although Van Patten refers to new evidence which another appointed attorney could present, Van Patten has submitted letters written prior to sentencing. Transcripts of the relevant state court proceedings have been submitted as a part of the answer. Van Patten provides no indication of the nature of any additional new evidence that could be proffered. Therefore, upon due consideration of the foregoing, this Court will deny Van Patten's motion for appointment of counsel.

The Court will now address Magistrate Goodstein's recommendation.[2] Although not labeled as an objection,

---

[2] Consideration of the state court's adjudication of Van Patten's due process and ineffective assistance claims is governed by the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA"), Pub. L. No. 104-132, 110 Stat. 1214 (codified

the Court will construe Van Patten's March 26, 2003, answer to order vacating judgment and a request for a C.O.A. ("*Answer to Order*") as an objection and will also consider Van Patten's August 5, 2003, supplemental to that submission. Van Patten takes issue with the statement in Magistrate Judge Goodstein's recommendation that Van Patten did not contact other attorneys for advice in overturning a plea prior to sentencing. Van Patten states that he has submitted Exhibit A which he describes as nine pages of letters written to Attorney Nila Robinson and Attorney James Connell prior to sentencing.

This Court is to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). In addressing Van Patten's claim that he was denied effective assistance of counsel under the Sixth Amendment, Magistrate Judge Goodstein stated that to prevail on his ineffective assistance claim, Van Patten must demonstrate that: 1) his counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness, and 2) was so prejudicial as to either render the proceeding fundamentally unfair or the result unreliable. *Recommendation to District Judge* at 3; *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687-88 (1984). To satisfy the

---

at 28 U.S.C. § 2254). Under the AEDPA, a state prisoner who petitions for a writ of habeas corpus must establish that the state court adjudication of his case was "contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly-established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1). Additionally, in reviewing the state trial and appellate courts' adjudication of an ineffective assistance claim, "federal courts MUST presume that all factual determinations made by the state courts, including credibility determinations, are correct, unless rebutted by clear and convincing evidence." *Murrell v. Frank*, 332 F.3d 1102, 1112 (7th Cir. 2003) (emphasis in original).

prejudice requirement, Van Patten must establish that "there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different." *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 694.

Magistrate Judge Goodstein noted that under *United States v. Cronic*, 466 U.S. 648 (1984), which was decided the same day as *Strickland*, the Supreme Court set out what is not so much a separate test as an exception to the *Strickland* test. *Recommendation to District Judge* at 3 *(citing Hollenbeck v. United States*, 987 F.2d 1272, 1275 [7th Cir. 1993]). Magistrate Judge Goodstein concluded that the assistance of trial counsel was effective under *Strickland*, but ineffective under *Cronic*. *Recommendation to District Judge* at 3.

Concluding that trial counsel's appearance by telephone was a harmless error even though it was a violation of Van Patten's Sixth Amendment right of effective assistance of counsel, Magistrate Judge Goodstein reasoned that Van Patten had ample time to withdraw his plea before sentencing and therefore, Van Patten was not prejudiced and no violation of clearly established federal law occurred. *Id.* at 3-4. Magistrate Judge Goodstein noted that Van Patten had nearly two months to withdraw his plea and did not attempt to do so. *Id.* at 4. The Magistrate Judge further noted that although at his post-conviction motion hearing, Van Patten stated that he did not move to withdraw his guilty plea because he did not know that he could do so, Van Patten's "after-the-fact statement lacks credibility." *Id.* Magistrate Judge Goodstein concluded that it is unlikely that Van Patten would go for nearly two months without telling anyone that he wanted to change his plea, especially considering his willingness to seek advice from another legal source. *Id.* Magistrate Judge Goodstein noted that on September 12, 1995, prior to the plea hearing in the Shawno County matter, Van Patten contacted Attorney Johnson, his at-

torney in a related matter in Waupaca County, to obtain that attorney's advice on the plea. *Id.* at 4-5.

In his *Answer to Order,* Van Patten states that he has now submitted letters written to Attorney Nila Robinson and Attorney James Connell, that Magistrate Judge Goodstein's statement is incorrect, and that he asked Attorney Robinson, Attorney Connell and Attorney Johnson how to take back this plea prior to sentencing. *Answer to Order* at 1. Van Patten further states that he informed the circuit court judge on two occasions — once in a letter stating that he was forced to take the plea due to District Attorney Bruno's threats to make sure that Van Patten would die in prison if he did not take the plea and that during sentencing he "requested to Judge Schmidt, that [he] wanted to take back his plea." *Id.* at 2.

Van Patten has submitted the first page of a letter date-stamped October 11, 1995, addressed to "Nila." (Exhibit [Exh.]A to the *Answer to Order* at 1 [unnumbered]). Due to the poor quality of the photocopy, portions are not readable. It does state that Van Patten "could see that he was not getting anywhere with both Attorneys Connell and Johnson they forced me into a plea. . ."

Next is the first page of a letter date-stamped January 17, 1995, to Nila Robinson. *Id.* at 2 [unnumbered]. Also included is the first page of a letter dated April 17, 1995, from Van Patten addressed "to whom it may concern" and received by the Board of Attorneys Professional Responsibility. *Id.* at 4 [unnumbered]. The letter states that Van Patten wants "to file a complaint about Mr. Connell's ineffective assistance." *Id.* While the letter makes specific complaints about Mr. Connell, it does not state that he forced Van Patten into a plea agreement.

Also included is a letter date stamped January 12, 1995, from Van Patten to Mr. Connell. *Id.* at 5 [unnum-

bered]. It states that it is Van Patten's understanding that Van Patten would receive a breakdown on Bruno's offer and what was said between them on January 5, 1995. Also provided are three one-page letters from Attorney Nila Jean Robinson to Van Patten and a two-page letter from her to Van Patten. *Id.* at 3, 6-9 [unnumbered]). None of the letters contained in Exhibit A support Van Pattens' contention that he asked Attorney Robinson, Attorney Connell and Attorney Johnson how to take back his plea prior to sentencing.

Van Patten also states during sentencing he "requested to Judge Schmidt, that [he] wanted to take back his plea." *Answer to Order* at 2. Review of the transcript of the November 6, 1995, sentencing proceedings before Judge Earl W. Schmidt discloses that Van Patten spoke during the proceedings, but he did not state that he wanted to withdraw the plea. (Answer to Petition for Habeas Corpus, Exh. H, Transcript of November 6, 1995, Sentencing Hearing at 24-25).

Notably at the post-conviction motion hearing conducted by Judge Schmidt, Van Patte.. testified that he was "forced to take a plea bargain." (Answer to Petition for Habeas Corpus, Exh. J, Transcript of August 22, 1996, Post-Conviction Motion Hearing at 9). At that hearing, Van Patten also argued that he "was forced all the way." (*Id.* at 48).

At the close of the August 22, 1996, hearing, the trial court issued oral rulings on Van Patten's post-conviction motions. Judge Schmidt stated that "I think the record would indicate your right to an attorney was not violated and you were not coerced into [the plea]." *Id.* at 51. The trial judge further stated that "[y]ou were very cognizant of what your options were, and you agreed to do what the records reflects you did; and I believe that everything that we heard since then is because you didn't like get-

ting 25 years." *Id.* The judge then denied Van Patten's motions for withdrawal of his plea and sentence modification. *Id.* at 52.

On appeal, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals noted the foregoing findings of the trial court. (Answer to Petition for Habeas Corpus, Exh E, *State of Wisconsin v. Joseph L. Patten,* No. 96-3036-CR, slip op. at 5-6 [Wis. Ct. App. May 28, 1997]). The appellate court stated that it had reviewed the record and found nothing to support Van Patten's allegation that counsel forced him to plead no contest. *Id.* at 6. The court of appeals further stated that "the record does not support, nor does Van Patten's appellate brief include, any argument that counsel's performance was deficient or prejudicial." *Id.* Therefore, the appellate court concluded that Van Patten's right to effective assistance of trial counsel was not violated. *Id.*

Based on this Court's review of the record and upon due consideration of Van Patten's arguments in his *Answer to Order,* this Court concludes that Van Patten has not demonstrated that he contacted counsel about withdrawing his plea or that he told the judge during sentencing that he wanted to withdraw his plea. Moreover, even if Van Patten could demonstrate that he did so, the state court's finding that Van Patten was not coerced to enter the plea and that he only sought to withdraw it after he was sentenced to 25 years of incarceration, is a credibility determination which has not been rebutted. *See Murrell,* 332 F.3d at 1112.

The bar for establishing that a state court's application of the *Strickland* standard was "unreasonable" is a high one: the court of appeals for this circuit has stated that "'only a clear error in applying *Strickland* would support a writ of habeas corpus.'" *Dixon v. Snyder,* 266 F.3d 693, 700-01 (7th Cir. 2001). It is clear from the record before this Court, and review of the law, that the

Wisconsin Court of Appeals properly identified and applied *Strickland* as the proper legal standard governing Van Patten's ineffective assistance claim. This Court cannot conclude that the state appellate court unreasonably applied the *Strickland* standard to the facts of the case and, therefore, this Court is without authority to grant Van Patten's petition for habeas relief. *See Bell v. Cone*, 535 U.S. 685, 694 (2002).

The Court concludes that Magistrate Judge Goodstein correctly determined that the assistance of trial counsel was effective under *Strickland*, but ineffective under *Cronic* and that trial counsel's appearance by telephone was a harmless error even though it was a violation of Van Patten's Sixth Amendment right of effective assistance of counsel. *Recommendation to District Judge* at 3-4. This Court also concludes that Magistrate Judge Goodstein properly recommended that Van Patten's petition should be dismissed. Therefore, this Court will adopt Magistrate Judge Goodstein's recommendation.

In his *Answer to Order*, Van Patten also requests a certificate of appealability. However, at this time no appeal has been filed. Therefore, Van Patten's request for a certificate of appealability is premature. In the event Van Patten files an appeal from this Court's decision, he should file a request for a certificate of appealability indicating why he believes reasonable jurists would find this Court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); *United States v. Slack*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). *See also, Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 123 S.Ct. 1029, 1039 (2003).

NOW, THEREFORE, BASED ON THE FOREGOING, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. McCaughtry's Motion to Substitute Thomas G. Borgen as Respondent (Docket #40) is **GRANTED,**

2. Van Patten's Motion for Extension of Time (Docket #33) is **DENIED,**

3. Van Patten's Motion for Extension of Time to File Certificate of Appealability (Docket # 34) is **DENIED,**

4. Van Patten's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Docket # 38) **DENIED,**
5. Van Patten's Motion for Order (Docket # 39) is **DENIED.**

6. Magistrate Judge Goodstein's March 7, 2003, Recommendation to District Judge is **ADOPTED** and Van Patten's petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 is **DENIED** and his petition is **DISMISSED.**

7. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to enter judgment accordingly.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 12th day of September, 2003.

SO ORDERED,

/s/ Rudolph T. Randa
HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA
Chief Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,

Petitioner,

v. **Case No. 98-C-1014**

GARY R. MCCAUGHTRY,

Respondent.

RECOMMENDATION TO DISTRICT JUDGE

Joseph L. Van Patten filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus on October 19, 1998. After the petition was screened pursuant to Rule 4, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, the state was ordered to answer the petition. The State answered and the court granted the petitioner's motion for the appointment of counsel. Attorney Elizabeth Cavendish-Sosinski was appointed counsel and the court granted her an extension to reply to the State's answer to the habeas petition. On September 6, 2000, she filed a traverse and because the court did not order any further briefing, the petition was ready for resolution. Since then, the petitioner has filed a number of letters concerning the assistance that was provided to him by his Attorney Cavendish-Sosinski. The court will now address the merits of Van Patten's petition and his concerns about the assistance of Attorney Cavendish-Sosinski.

In his petition, which was submitted pro se, Van Patten alleges that he was denied the effective assistance of counsel in violation of the Sixth Amendment because his attorney did not appear in person at his plea hearing, but appeared by telephone instead. Further, the plaintiff

alleges that the attorney's appearance by telephone was in violation of Wisconsin State Law.

In its answer to the habeas petition, the State argues that even though the attorney's failure to appear in person may violate Wisconsin state law, there is no violation of clearly established federal law and consequently, the petition should be denied.

Because the petition does not have any significant legal analysis, the court would have required further briefing on the issue if not for the traverse filed by Attorney Cavendish-Sosinski on behalf of the petitioner. In the traverse, the petitioner argues that the failure of his attorney to be present for his entering of a guilty plea violated both his Fourteenth Amendment due process and Sixth Amendment rights.

Due Process

The petitioner argues in the traverse that he was denied fundamental fairness afforded by due process because his then-counsel (not Cavendish-Sosinski) was not present at the plea proceedings. The petitioner argues that he was denied the ability to have his counsel present to answer any questions he might have. Instead, he was left alone before a "foreboding court," unwilling to stand up for himself because he was afraid to anger the judge who would be handing down his sentence. In short, the petitioner argues that the appearance of his counsel by telephone was like having no counsel at all, which was fundamentally unfair and in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The only infirmity that the petitioner finds in the plea proceeding is that his counsel appeared by telephone. Essentially, the Fourteenth Amendment due process claim is based upon the alleged ineffective assistance of counsel claim. However, the due process clause does not have its own guarantee of the assistance of counsel. Rather, the Fourteenth Amendment incorporates the Sixth Amend-

ment's right to counsel and applies it to the states. See Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, Consequently, there is no reason for a separate analysis of the petitioner's ineffective assistance of counsel claims under the Fourteenth Amendment. Therefore, the court turns to the Sixth Amendment analysis.

Sixth Amendment

The petitioner argues because his attorney was not physically present at his plea proceedings, his Sixth Amendment right to effective counsel was violated under either of the tests created by the United State Supreme Court in Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984) or United States v. Cronic, 466 U.S. 648 (1984), which were decided on the same day.

Strickland is a two-pronged test. The first prong requires the court to determine whether the defense counsel's assistance fell below "an objective standard of reasonableness." Hollenback v. United States, 987 F.2d 1272, 1275 (7th Cir. 1993). However, there is a strong presumption that the counsel's conduct is reasonable. Id. In the second prong, the court must determine whether counsel's performance was so prejudicial as to either render the proceeding fundamentally unfair or the result unreliable. Id.

Cronic, is not so much a separate test as it is an exception to the two-pronged Strickland test. Hollenback at 1275. Under Cronic, when an accused is denied the assistance of counsel at a critical stage in his trial, that counsel's actions will be deemed so egregious and prejudicial that ineffective assistance of counsel is presumed. Id. A critical stage is defined as "one where potential substantial prejudice to [a] defendant's rights inheres in the particular confrontation and where counsel's abilities can help avoid that prejudice." Id.

Here, the assistance of the petitioner's trial counsel, Attorney Connell, was effective under Strickland, but in-

effective under Cronic. However, Connell's appearance by telephone was a harmless error even though it was a violation of Van Patten's Sixth Amendment right to the effective assistance of counsel. The court acknowledges that Attorney Connell's appearance by telephone at the plea proceeding is not authorized by Wis. Stats. § 967.08, which allows telephone appearances in certain other situations. Even though a violation of state law occurred, it did not prejudice the petitioner or cause a violation of clearly established federal law. This is because under Wisconsin law, the petitioner had ample opportunity to withdraw his plea before sentencing.

In Wisconsin, two different standards apply when a defendant moves to withdraw his plea, depending on when the motion occurs. State v. Thomas, 605 N.W.2d 836, 842 (Wis. 2000). If the defendant moves to withdraw the plea before sentencing, a circuit court should permit the withdrawal for any fair and just reason. Id. The defendant must prove that a fair and just reason exists by a preponderance of the evidence. Id. However, if the motion to withdraw the plea occurs after sentencing has taken place, the defendant has the heavy burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that the trial court should permit the defendant to withdraw his plea to correct a manifest injustice. Id. at 843.

In this case, Van Patten entered his guilty plea on September 12, 1995, but his sentencing was not until November 6, 1995. Van Patten, had nearly two months to attempt to withdraw his plea. Certainly, had he argued that his attorney's appearance by telephone violated Wisconsin law and adversely affected the voluntariness of his plea, this would have constituted a "fair and just reason" to permit a withdrawal. However, he did not attempt to withdraw his plea. And although the petitioner, in his post-conviction hearing states that he did not move to withdraw the plea because he did not know that he could do so, (Respondent's Exhibit J at 25), this after-the-fact statement lacks credibility. It is unlikely that the peti-

tioner would go for nearly two months without telling anyone that he wanted to change his plea, especially considering his willingness to seek legal advice from another source. The petitioner contacted Attorney Johnson, his attorney in a related matter in Waupaca County on September 12, 1995 , before he entered his plea to obtain that attorney's advice on the plea. (Exhibit J at 7, 38-40). However, Attorney Johnson would not comment on the plea other than to tell the petitioner how it might affect his Waupaca County trial. (Exhibit J at 38-40). Therefore it is reasonable to infer that if the petitioner was unhappy with the guilty plea he entered, he would have sought further advice from Attorney Johnson or would have contacted another attorney prior to sentencing to express his unhappiness with the plea.

Although not raised in his habeas corpus petition, at his post-conviction hearing the petitioner argued that he was intimidated into pleading guilty by both his attorney and the prosecutor. (Exhibit J at 9). This argument is belied by the fact that Van Patten was not too intimidated to call his other attorney to solicit advice about the plea agreement moments before he was to enter the plea.

In addition, his argument that he was intimidated by Attorney Connell contradicts his ineffective assistance of counsel claims. According to Van Patten, Connell's appearance by telephone was enough to intimidate him, but not enough to provide meaningful assistance.

Further, at the sentencing, at which time Connell was physically present, the petitioner acknowledged to the court that he entered into the plea voluntarily and that he understood the legal proceedings and his legal rights. (Exhibit J at 14-26). It was not until he received his sentence that Van Patten first voiced dissatisfaction with the plea. Before entering his guilty plea to first degree reckless homicide, Attorney Connell told Van Patten that he thought that he could get him a ten-year sentence and that he thought that Van Patten would be out in four or five years. (Exhibit J at 10). However, the court sentenced

him to a twenty-five year sentence. (Exhibit I at 27). It is only after this larger sentence was handed down did Van Patten express his desire to withdraw his plea. He did attempt to withdraw his plea at a post-conviction hearing, but he was unable to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the failure to allow his plea to be withdrawn would result in a manifest injustice.

Under Strickland, after applying Cronic, even if the court would conclude that Attorney Connell's conduct was unreasonable, because it was in violation of the Wisconsin Statute, the above facts clearly indicate that Connell's failure to appear in person was not so prejudicial as to render the proceedings unfair or make the end result unreliable. Consequently, Van Patten was not denied the effective assistance of counsel under Strickland.

Attorney Connell was physically absent at a critical stage of the trial. Under Hollenback, a critical stage is one where a substantial prejudice is inherent in the confrontation and the presence of counsel help to avoid the prejudice. Hollenback, 987 F.2d at 1275. The Wisconsin statute allows attorneys to appear by telephone at some proceedings and not at others. Wis. Stats. § 967.08. The proceedings where attorneys are allowed to appear by telephone are the type of proceedings that do not have the inherent prejudice that Hollenback addresses. Consequently, implicit in the statute is the notion that any proceeding not listed in the statute is so critical that counsel should be present. Therefore, the plea proceeding where Van Patten entered his guilty plea is a critical proceeding and therefore the Cronic analysis is applicable.

Under Cronic, Attorney Connell's assistance is presumed to be ineffective and in violation of the Sixth Amendment. And although Van Patten does not need to prove that he was prejudiced under the Cronic analysis, it does not mean that a finding of ineffective counsel under Cronic automatically leads to a reversal.

In some situations where counsel was absent from a critical stage of the trial, the court must review the con-

stitutional violation to determine whether it was a harmless error. Siverson v. O'Leary, 764 F.2d 1208, 1217 (7th Cir. 1985) (holding that constitutional violation that arose out of attorney's complete absence from the courtroom during jury deliberations and the verdict was harmless); see *also* United States v. Morrison, 946 F.2d 484, 503-04 (7th Cir. 1991) (holding that constitutional violation that arose out of attorney's complete absence during return of the verdict was not harmful when the court, on its own initiative, polled the jury). A Sixth Amendment violation must affect and contaminate the entire criminal proceeding to justify dispensing with the harmless error analysis and presuming harmfulness. Morrison, 964 F.2d at 503 (citing Satterwhite v. Texas, 486 U.S. 249, 257 (1988)). The Seventh Circuit noted that one instance where the absence of counsel would be harmful is at the arraignment in a capital case. Siverson, 764 F.2d at 1217.

Here, the court cannot say that the Sixth Amendment violation affected and contaminated the entire case. Attorney Connell did appear at the plea proceeding by telephone, which means that Van Patten was not completely without the assistance of counsel. The transcript of the plea proceeding indicates that Attorney Connell took an active part in the plea proceeding. Exhibit H. Further, there is no indication that Attorney Connell would have done anything different if he had been present in person. Additionally, the court conducted a significant colloquy with Van Patten to make sure that he understood the ramifications of his plea. Exhibit H at 6-15. And, as stated above, Van Patten had ample time and sufficient reasons to withdraw his plea, if that was what he wanted to do. As a result, the court must review the violation of Van Patten's Sixth Amendment right to see if it was harmless.

The reviewing court must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the constitutional violation was, in fact, harmless before it can call it a "harmless error." Chapman v. California, 386 U.S. 18, 22 (1967). For all the reasons

stated in both the Strickland and Cronic analyses, the court concludes that Attorney Connell's appearance by telephone, although a Sixth Amendment violation under Cronic, was harmless beyond a reasonable doubt. Consequently, Van Patten's petition for a writ of habeas corpus should be denied.

Assistance of Counsel on Habeas Petition

Since Attorney Cavendish-Sosinski filed the traverse, the petitioner has corresponded with the court on multiple occasions concerning the effectiveness of his appointed counsel. Van Patten is concerned because his attorney has not communicated with him. Attorney Cavendish-Sosinski's traverse was well written and presented the only feasible legal arguments in this case. Once the traverse was submitted, there was nothing for Attorney Cavendish-Sosinski to do but wait for the court's decision. She is not to be blamed for the weight of the court's calendar and the delay in issuing a decision. The court is certain that Attorney Cavendish-Sosinksi's representation was effective and competent. That being said, a letter to the petitioner, with a courtesy copy to the court to let the petitioner know that there was nothing more that she could do until the court issued a decision in the matter may have alleviated the petitioner's concerns and perhaps some headaches for Attorney Cavendish-Sosinski.

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED that Van Patten's petition for a writ of habeas corpus be **denied** and the petition and this case should be **dismissed**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 7th day of March, 2003.

/s/ Aaron E. Goodstein
AARON E GOODSTEIN
United States Magistrate Judge

Office of the Clerk

SUPREME COURT

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 715
P.O. BOX 1688
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

TELEPHONE (608) 266-1880
FACSIMILE (608) 267-0640

To:

October 14, 1997

Hon. Earl W. Schmidt
Shawano County Circuit Court
311 N. Main Street, Room 206
Shawano, WI 54166

Bruce A. Craig
Assistant Attorney General
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, WI 53707-7857

Gary R. Bruno
Shawano County District Attorney
311 N. Main Street
Shawano, WI 54166

Owen F. Monfils
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 1251
Green Bay, WI 54305-1251

You are hereby notified that the Court has entered the following order:

No. 96-3036-CR State v. Van Patten L.C.#94CF73

A petition for review pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 808.10 having been filed on behalf of defendant-appellant-petitioner, Joseph L. Van Patten, and considered by the court,

IT IS ORDERED that the petition for review is denied, without costs.

Marilyn L. Graves
Clerk of Supreme Court

COURT OF APPEALS
DECISION
DATED AND RELEASED

May 28, 1997

NOTICE

A party may file with the Supreme Court a petition to review an adverse decision by the Court of Appeals. *See* § 808.10 and RULE 809.62, STATS.

This opinion is subject to further editing. If published, the official version will appear in the bound volume of the Official Reports.

No. 96-3036-CR.

STATE OF WISCONSIN **IN COURT OF APPEALS**
DISTRICT III

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,
Defendant-Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the circuit court for Shawano County: EARL SCHMIDT, Judge. *Affirmed.*

Before Cane, P.J., LaRocque and Myse, JJ.

CANE, P.J. Joseph Van Patten appeals the denial of his motion to withdraw his no contest plea.[1] He asserts

---

[1] The court also denied Van Patten's motion for sentence modification. However, because Van Patten's appeal only presents arguments pertaining to the denial of his motion to withdraw his no contest plea, we do not address the merits of his

that his right to counsel was violated because his attorney appeared at the plea hearing by telephone, contrary to § 967.08, STATS. Van Patten also asserts his Sixth Amendment right to counsel was violated when his attorney discussed the plea offer with him by telephone and appeared at the hearing by telephone, resulting in his incomplete understanding of the charges against him and the constitutional rights he was waiving with his plea.

The State argues the appearance of defense counsel by telephone at the plea hearing does not constitute a "manifest injustice" sufficient to justify the withdrawal of Van Patten's plea, and defense counsel's telephonic appearance at the plea hearing did not deny Van Patten his Sixth Amendment right to counsel. We agree with the State and affirm the order.

Van Patten was charged with one count of first-degree intentional homicide. Pursuant to a plea agreement, he pled no contest to a reduced charge of first- degree reckless homicide, in violation of § 940.02(1), STATS., and was sentenced to twenty-five years in prison. Van Patten's attorney discussed the plea agreement with him and appeared at the plea hearing over a speaker phone. The court denied Van Patten's postconviction motions for the withdrawal of his plea and sentence modification. He now appeals.

The trial court's decision to deny a postconviction motion for the withdrawal of a guilty or no contest plea is discretionary, and we will reverse only if there has been an erroneous exercise of discretion. *See* ***State v. Spears***,

---

motion for sentence modification. *See* ***Reiman Assocs., Inc. v. R/A Advertising, Inc.***, 102 Wis. 2d 305, 306 n.1, 306 N.W.2d 292, 294 n.1 (Ct. App. 1981) (An issue raised but not briefed or argued is deemed abandoned).

147 Wis. 2d 429, 434, 433 N.W.2d 595, 598 (Ct. App. 1988). To succeed on a motion to withdraw a no contest plea, the defendant must show "manifest injustice" by clear and convincing evidence. ***Id.*** Examples of manifest injustice include the following:

> (1) ineffective assistance of counsel; (2) the defendant did not personally enter or ratify the plea; (3) the plea was involuntary; (4) the prosecutor failed to fulfill the plea agreement; (5) the defendant did not receive the concessions tentatively or fully concurred in by the court, and the defendant did not reaffirm the plea after being told that the court no longer concurred in the agreement; and, (6) the court had agreed that the defendant could withdraw the plea if the court deviated from the plea agreement.

State v. Krieger, 163 Wis. 2d 241, 251 n.6, 471 N.W.2d 599, 602 n.6 (Ct. App. 1991) (citations omitted). Additionally, the violation of the defendant's Sixth Amendment right to counsel may constitute a manifest injustice.

Van Patten asserts that his attorney's appearance by telephone at the plea hearing violated § 967.08, STATS., which permits specifically enumerated proceedings to be conducted by telephone. We agree. Plea hearings are not included in the statute. In ***State v. Vennemann***, 180 Wis. 2d 81, 508 N.W.2d 404 (1993), our supreme court decided that the defendant's telephonic appearance for a postconviction evidentiary hearing was not permitted by § 967.08.

> Section 967.08 specifically enumerates proceedings intended to be included within the parameters of the statute. There is no mention of a postconviction evidentiary hearing. We apply the principle of statutory construction that a specific

> alternative in a statute is reflective of the legislative intent that any alternative not so enumerated is to be excluded. A postconviction evidentiary hearing . . . clearly is not a criminal proceeding which may be conducted by telephone.

Id. at 96-97, 508 N.W.2d at 410 (citation omitted). Pursuant to the logic of ***Vennemann***, Van Patten is correct that his attorney's telephonic appearance at the plea hearing does not conform to the provisions of § 967.08(2), STATS.[2]

Van Patten asserts the court's procedural error denied him his Sixth Amendment right to counsel. We review issues of constitutional fact de novo. *See* ***State v. Turner***, 136 Wis. 2d 333, 344, 401 N.W.2d 827, 832 (1987). A criminal defendant's right to counsel is guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution and by art. I, § 7, of the Wisconsin Constitution. Van Patten claims the lack of his attorney's physical presence at the plea hearing violated his right to counsel. We disagree.

The plea hearing transcript neither indicates any deficiency in the plea colloquy, nor suggests that Van Patten's attorney's participation by telephone interfered in any way with his ability to communicate with his attorney about his plea. Van Patten confirmed that he had thoroughly discussed his case and plea decision with his attorney and was satisfied with the legal representation he had received. The court gave Van Patten the opportunity to speak privately with his attorney over the phone if he had questions about the plea, but Van Patten declined.

---

[2] Because we conclude that § 967.08(2), STATS., does not permit plea hearings to be conducted by telephone, we do not address Van Patten's additional argument that, contrary to § 967.08(2), he did not consent to the telephonic proceedings.

Further, when Van Patten exercised his right to allocution at sentencing, in the personal presence of his attorney, he raised no objection to his plea. We conclude Van Patten knowingly and voluntarily entered his plea, despite the lack of his attorney's physical presence at the plea hearing. The court's failure to conform with § 967.08, STATS., was harmless error, and neither interfered with Van Patten's understanding of the plea nor resulted in manifest injustice.

The right to counsel includes the right to effective assistance of counsel. ***McMann v. Richardson***, 397 U.S. 759, 771 n.14 (1985). In order to prove ineffective assistance of counsel, the defendant must establish that his attorney's performance was both deficient and prejudicial. ***State v. Bentley***, 201 Wis. 2d 303, 312, 548 N.W.2d 50, 54 (1996) (citing ***Strickland v. Washington***, 466 U.S. 668, 687 (1984)).[3] [FN3] Counsel's performance is not deficient unless he or she "made errors so serious that counsel was not functioning as the 'counsel' guaranteed the defendant by the Sixth Amendment." Strickland, 466 U.S. at 687. To demonstrate prejudice, the defendant must allege facts to show "that there is a reasonable probability that, but for the counsel's errors, he would not have pleaded guilty and would have insisted on going to trial." Bentley, 201 Wis. 2d at 312, 548 N.W.2d at 54 (quoting Hill v. Lockhart, 474 U.S. 52, 59, 106 S.Ct. 366, 88 L.Ed.2d 203 (1985)).

The standard of review of the performance and prejudice prongs of ***Strickland*** is a mixed question of law and

---

[3] ***Strickland v. Washington***, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), applies to guilty or no contest pleas based on ineffective assistance of counsel. ***Hill v. Lockhart***, 474 U.S. 52, 57-58 (1985); ***State v. Bentley***, 201 Wis. 2d 303, 311-12, 548 N.W.2d 50, 54 (1996).

fact, and the trial court's findings of fact will not be overturned unless clearly erroneous. ***State v. Johnson***, 153 Wis. 2d 121, 127, 449 N.W.2d 845, 848 (1990). The ultimate determination whether the conduct of an attorney constitutes ineffective assistance of counsel is a question of law we review de novo. ***Id.*** at 128, 449 N.W.2d at 848. The trial court decided that Van Patten's right to counsel was not violated and he was not coerced into making the no contest plea because, aware of his options, Van Patten agreed to enter the plea. We have reviewed the record with due deference to the trial court's findings, and find nothing to support Van Patten's allegation that counsel forced him to plead no contest. The record does not support, nor does Van Patten's appellate brief include, any argument that counsel's performance was deficient or prejudicial. Therefore, we conclude Van Patten's right to effective assistance counsel was not violated. No manifest injustice exists to support plea withdrawal.

By the Court.—Order affirmed.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
CIRCUIT COURT FOR MENOMINEE/SHAWANO CO.
SHAWANO COUNTY DIVISION – BRANCH NO. I

STATE OF WISCONSIN,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
-vs-	)	CASE NO. 94-CF-73
JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,	)	
Defendant.	)	

POSTCONVICTION MOTION HEARING
(AUGUST 22, 1996)

Whereupon the following proceedings were had upon a hearing held in the above-entitled matter before the HONORABLE EARL W. SCHMIDT, Presiding Judge of Branch No. I of the Circuit Court for Menominee/Shawano Counties, State of Wisconsin, commencing on Thursday, August 22nd, 1996, at 10:15 a.m., at the Shawano County Courthouse in Shawano, Wisconsin.

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF:
Mr. GARY ROBERT BRUNO
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT:
DEFENDANT APPEARS IN PERSON IN
CUSTODY AND BY:

MR. OWEN F. MONFILS
APPOINTED ASSISTANT STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER (GREEN BAY, WI)

* * * * * * *

(Whereupon the following proceedings were had and testimony was taken upon the hearing held in the above-entitled matter before the Court at said time:)

[witnesses' testimony omitted]

[arguments of counsel omitted]

ORAL RULINGS BY THE COURT:

Well, I think the totality of the transcripts and your testimony would indicate what you wanted was a short time in prison. I think that's what the Court gathers from that, and, of course, that's not uncommon. There's a common denominator among people engaged in criminal behavior, and I suppose those who are not criminals -- and that's why the average person doesn't become a criminal -- is that they don't want to spend any time in jail. He doesn't want to be locked up. Regardless of the things we do, we still think we should not have to spend a lot of time incarcerated. So the crux of everything the Court has heard here is that you are not satisfied with the sentence that you received. That's what the Court hears here, and you certainly are not alone in that.

As to your alternative motion for modification of sentence, the record here totally reflects that you were very cognizant of trying to get the plea lessened, and you alternately insisted on a trial, which from your experience in the affairs of life means if you take a tough stance, you probably come out better, and you engaged in negotiations, and you eventually decided you were going to take a plea, and it was -- most of your negotiations with your

attorney were by phone, so Mr. Connell set it up, and he appeared by phone, and you were here.

Now, just because you didn't get the sentence that Mr. Connell thought he was going to argue for certainly doesn't mean you have a right to come in here and withdraw your plea. That would not be a basis to do that. The Court gave you the sentence it thought was proper for the act that was committed. It was for taking the life of someone else with a gun. What more can you say about that?

As to whether or not his right to an attorney was violated because the attorney was on the phone, I don't know of any precise law right on the point. But if his argument is that he was forced by his attorney to do this, an attorney on the phone is certainly less intimidating than one standing right next to him. So that's not consistent at all with what he is trying to tell the Court here. If he thought this attorney was forcing him to do it, it certainly would be easier to say, "Well, the guy is on the phone, but, Judge, he's making me do it," and we all know that that would have been the end of it right there. That's not what happened. What happened was he went right along with this because he thought this was the best deal he could get, because he knew what happened to Mr. Anderson. He had shot him. He thought, "Well, I have to get the best deal I can because there's nice things in the world and this would be the quickest way for me to get out of jail." That's what he was thinking, and I don't think his right to an attorney was violated. Mr. Connell is a competent attorney, and the Court knows that, and he got a lesser charge. He thought if he could get the Court to go with 10 years he would probably be out on parole in four or five. I guess that's probably not pie-in-the-sky thinking in any case. I don't even know what your parole date is right now. It probably isn't that far away, for all the Court knows. I don't know, but I think this record would indicate your right to an attorney was not violated and you were not coerced into doing this. You were very cog-

nizant of what your options were, and you agreed to do what the record reflects you did; and I believe that everything that we heard since then is because you didn't like getting 25 years. Well, that's what the Court thought you should get, and I think it was the proper sentence for taking another person's life, and I still think that's the proper sentence. So there will be no modification of that, and the Court denies all motions.

[discussion of unrelated matters omitted]

OPPOSITION BRIEF

70

No. 07-212

FILED
OCT 17 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In the Supreme Court of the United States

RANDALL WRIGHT, SHAWANO COUNTY SHERIFF,
SHAWANO COUNTY, WISCONSIN, PETITIONER

v.

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN, RESPONDENT

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

LINDA T. COBERLY
Counsel of Record
JUSTIN E. ENDRES
MATTHEW J. HERNANDEZ
Winston & Strawn LLP
35 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 558-5600

WILSON-EPES PRINTING CO., INC. – (202) 789-0096 – WASHINGTON, D. C. 20002

QUESTION PRESENTED

The lawyer appointed to represent Joseph Van Patten failed to appear in person at the plea hearing where Van Patten surrendered his constitutional rights. While the lawyer did participate by speakerphone, the trial judge did not ask Van Patten's consent to proceed without his lawyer present and did not guarantee Van Patten's ability to confer with his lawyer privately during this critical hearing. The lawyer also was not in a position to observe his client's demeanor and assure himself that his client understood the proceedings and was entering an intelligent and voluntary plea.

This case presents the question whether, in light of this Court's decision in *Carey* v. *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. 649 (2006), the Seventh Circuit properly held that Van Patten was entitled to relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 based on its conclusion that his Sixth Amendment claim was governed by *United States* v. *Cronic*, 466 U.S. 648 (1984)—rather than *Strickland* v. *Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984)—and thus that the state courts had reached a decision contrary to this Court's cases by requiring him to prove prejudice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTION PRESENTED i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

I. State Proceedings 2

A. Plea Hearing 2

B. Decision on Post Conviction Relief 5

C. Wisconsin Appellate Court Proceedings 5

II. Federal Court Habeas Corpus Proceedings 6

A. Magistrate Judge Recommendation 6

B. District Court Proceedings 7

C. Seventh Circuit Decision 9

D. United States Supreme Court Order 11

E. The Seventh Circuit's Decision on Remand 12

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION 13

I. The petition fails to identify any conflicts among the Circuits or with any relevant decision of this Court with regard to the scope of Section 2254 15

II. The Seventh Circuit's decision does not conflict with decisions of this Court in respect to the standard to be applied to right-to-counsel cases in plea hearings. 21

III. The Seventh Circuit did not substitute its own factual conclusions for those of the state courts 27

CONCLUSION 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

Bell v. *Cone*,
535 U.S. 685 (2002) 21, 23

Carey v. *Musladin*,
127 S.Ct. 649 (2006) ..... *passim*

Childress v. *Johnson*,
103 F.3d 1221 (5th Cir. 1997) 23

Davis v. *Alaska*,
415 U.S. 308 (1974) 23

Faretta v. *California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975) 19

Hamilton v. *Alabama*,
368 U.S. 52 (1961) 9, 16, 23

Hill v. *Lockhart*,
474 U.S. 52 ..... 21, 24, 25

Iowa v. *Tovar*,
541 U.S. 77 (2004) 23

Kane v. *Garcia Espitia*,
126 S.Ct. 407 ..... 19, 20

Lockyer v. *Andrade*,
538 U.S. 63 (2003) 16, 17, 19, 20

Powell v. *Alabama*,
287 U.S. 45 (1932) 16

Ramdass v. *Angelone*,
530 U.S. 156 (2000) 19

Strickland v. *Washington*,
466 U.S. 668 (1984) ..... *passim*

United States v. *Cronic*,
466 U.S. 648 (1984) ..... *passim*

White v. *Maryland*,
373 U.S. 59 (1963) 16, 23, 28

Williams v. *Taylor*,
529 U.S. 362 (2000) 18, 19, 26

Wright v. *West*,
505 U.S. 277 (1992) 18

Yarborough v. *Alvarado*,
541 U.S. 652 (2004) 18

STATUTES AND REGULATIONS:

28 U.S.C. § 2254 ..... *passim*

Wisconsin Statute § 967.08 5

OTHER:

RANDY HERTZ & JAMES S. LIEBNAM,
FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS PRACTICE &
PROCEDURE (5th ed. 2005) 19

INTRODUCTION

Further review is not warranted in this case. The petition does not point to any disagreements among the Circuits, and it fails to identify any conflict between the decision below and decisions of this Court. More fundamentally, the hyperbolic question posed by Petitioner—whether federal courts will "abide by the limits Congress has imposed on the issuance of federal habeas corpus relief" (Pet. at 4)—is not presented here. This is a simple right-to-counsel case that called for the application of clear and long-established federal law.

While the original petition for certiorari in this case was pending last Term, this Court issued its decision in *Carey* v. *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. 649 (2006), which concerned the scope of "clearly established Federal law" under Section 2254. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d). The Court remanded the instant case for further consideration in light of the new decision, and the Seventh Circuit carefully undertook that analysis in a separate published opinion, concluding that *Musladin* did not require a different result. In *Musladin*, this Court held that relief under Section 2254 should have been denied where the legal question before the state courts was an "open question" in this Court's jurisprudence. But as the Seventh Circuit recognized, the instant case "does not concern an open constitutional question." Pet. at A2. The question presented in this petition—and before the Seventh Circuit on remand—is whether, through the lens of Section 2254, the particular failure of counsel in this case should have been analyzed under *Strickland* v. *Washington*, 466 U.S. 52 (1985), which requires a separate showing of prejudice, or under

United States v. *Cronic*, 466 U.S. 52 (1985), which does not. There is no doubt that *Strickland* and *Cronic* both represent clearly established principles of federal constitutional law, nor is there any doubt that this case must be analyzed under one or the other. According to the Seventh Circuit, the state courts chose the wrong set of U.S. Supreme Court cases to apply. That was enough to warrant relief under Section 2254, even under *Musladin*.

Although Petitioner may disagree with the Seventh Circuit's decision, his petition does not point to any basis for a grant of certiorari. The petition should be denied.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. State Proceedings

A. Plea Hearing

The state proceedings began when Van Patten was charged with one count of first-degree intentional homicide following a fatal shooting in Shawano County, Wisconsin. Attorney James B. Connell was appointed to serve as Van Patten's counsel and began exploring the possibility of a plea.

As he awaited trial, Van Patten received word that he would be appearing at a plea hearing in court later that same day. Before he left the county jail, his appointed counsel conferred with him by telephone about a plea agreement reached with the prosecutor. Post-Conviction Hrg. Tr. 5. Under this agreement, Van Patten would enter a plea of "no contest" to a charge of first degree reckless homicide with a penalty enhancer for a dangerous weapon. Pl. Hrg. Tr. 3. The agreement did not include a sentencing

range. *Id.* at 10. By entering a plea of "no contest," Van Patten would effectively be admitting that he committed all the elements of the crime of first degree reckless homicide.

At the end of his conversation with Connell, Van Patten asked him "if he was going to be there [at the hearing], and he said no." Post-Conviction Hrg. Tr. 6. Van Patten later testified that he had some questions and concerns that he did not have an opportunity to raise with his counsel, including about the interplay between the plea agreement and a related charge then pending in another jurisdiction. *Id.* at 6-8. He also testified that he explained to Connell before the plea hearing that he "wanted to go to jury trial" and that he "didn't want [a] plea bargain to begin with." *Id.* at 9.

At the hearing itself, attorney Connell participated only by speakerphone. Pl. Hrg. Tr. 1. At no point during the hearing did he or the judge ask Van Patten whether he objected to his attorney's participation by speakerphone, nor did they ask whether Van Patten would prefer to move the hearing to a time when his attorney was available to appear in person. Instead, the judge warned Van Patten that any discussions he had with his attorney during the hearing would be "on the record," unless Van Patten made a special request, in which case the court could "perhaps" get Connell "on the line in a private place":

> THE COURT: All right, now, before your plea is entered and accepted by the Court, the Court will ask you certain questions to determine whether or not your pleas should be entered and accepted. If you have any

> trouble understanding any question, take all the time you need to confer with your attorney, and we can perhaps get him on the line in a private place so you could talk to him privately also. Do you understand that?
>
> THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Sir.
>
> THE COURT: Everything here is going to be on the record.
>
> THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your honor. [Pl. Hrg. 6]

At one point the judge noted that "Mr. Van Patten wanted to say something" and asked counsel on the telephone, "Do you object to him saying something?" *Id.* at 22. Counsel responded, "If it's about the visit," referring to the question whether Van Patten would be allowed an hour-long visit at the county jail with his seven-year-old daughter. *Id.* at 21-24. Van Patten's only extended comments on the record at the hearing related to whether he would be able to visit with his daughter.

Van Patten entered a plea of no contest and surrendered his constitutional right to defend himself at trial. He later explained that at the time of the plea, he "didn't know what to do." *Id.* Further, when asked whether he made a request to the Court to speak with his lawyer privately during the hearing, Van Patten explained that he had not done so "because Mr. Connell told [him] just say yes and just go along with everything." *Id.* at 13-14. Van Patten testified that he believes he would not have entered the plea if his attorney had been present that day. *Id.* at 13.

At a later hearing, Van Patten was sentenced to the maximum possible term of 25 years in prison.

B. Decision on Post Conviction Relief

After retaining different counsel, Van Patten filed a motion to withdraw his plea and for other relief, based in part on his contention that his Sixth Amendment right to counsel had been violated because of his counsel's failure to appear in person at the plea hearing. The State of Wisconsin opposed this motion, arguing in relevant part that Van Patten had failed to show ineffective assistance of counsel under *Strickland*. Post-Conviction Mot. Hrg. Tr. 47.

In an oral ruling, the court denied Van Patten's motion. *Id.* at 49-52, Pet. at A52-A55. The court included little analysis of Van Patten's argument concerning his advocate's failure to appear in person, commenting bizarrely that Van Patten may have been better off without him present. *Id.* at 50, Pet. at A54 ("if his argument is that he was forced by his attorney to [take the plea], an attorney on the phone is certainly less intimidating than one standing right next to him").

C. Wisconsin Appellate Court Proceedings

Van Patten appealed, arguing that he was denied the assistance of counsel by virtue of his counsel's participation by speakerphone at the plea hearing, in violation of both Wisconsin law and the Sixth Amendment. The court of appeals affirmed. *See* Pet. at A46-A51. The court acknowledged that Wisconsin Statute § 967.08—which authorizes certain proceedings to be conducted by phone—does *not* permit an attorney to appear by speakerphone at a plea hearing. Pet. at A48-A49. The court held, however, that this "procedural error" was not a

"manifest injustice" sufficient to permit Van Patten to withdraw his no contest plea. *Id.* at A50.

As for Van Patten's Sixth Amendment claim, the court of appeals applied the two-prong analysis in *Strickland* and indicated that in order to satisfy the "prejudice" prong, "the defendant must allege facts to show that there is a reasonable probability that, but for the counsel's errors, he would not have pleaded guilty and would have insisted on going to trial." *Id.* at A50 (citations omitted). The court concluded that counsel's participation in the hearing by telephone did not "interfere[] in any way with [Van Patten's] ability to communicate with his attorney about his plea." *Id.* at A49. The court referred to passages in the plea colloquy in which Van Patten agreed that he had thoroughly discussed the plea with his attorney and was satisfied with his representation. *Ibid.* The court also noted that Van Patten had not asked to speak privately with his attorney during the colloquy and had raised no objection to the plea during his allocution at sentencing, when his attorney was physically present. *Id.* at A50. Accordingly, the court concluded that Van Patten was not entitled to relief under *Strickland*. *Id.* at A51.

Van Patten also sought discretionary review in the Wisconsin Supreme Court, but his petition was denied.

II. Federal Court Habeas Corpus Proceedings

A. Magistrate Judge Recommendation

Van Patten then filed a *pro se* petition for relief under Section 2254, asserting a violation of his Sixth Amendment right to counsel in connection with his plea hearing. On January 17, 2003, a magistrate

judge issued an order denying the petition. Rec. 28. The magistrate judge concluded that counsel was "ineffective under *Cronic*," the decision by this Court that stands for the proposition that the denial of counsel at a critical stage in the proceedings is presumptively prejudicial. Magistrate Judge's Order (Rec. 28 at 3), Pet. at A38-39.[1] Nevertheless, the magistrate judge denied relief based on his conclusion that counsel's ineffectiveness under *Cronic* was harmless error, because counsel "did appear at the plea proceeding by telephone" and the court "conducted a significant colloquy with Van Patten to make sure that he understood the ramifications of his plea." Rec. 28. at 7, Pet. at A42. The magistrate judge also noted that Van Patten "had ample time and sufficient reasons to withdraw his plea" before sentencing, and "there is no indication that Attorney Connell would have done anything different if he had been present in person." *Id.*

Although the Clerk of Court initially entered final judgment based on that order, the magistrate judge later vacated the order and directed the Clerk to transfer the matter to a district judge, converting his prior order into a recommendation to the district court. The case was then assigned to Chief Judge Rudolph T. Randa.

B. District Court Proceedings

Van Patten then filed an answer to the order vacating the judgment, as well as a request for a

---

[1] At the same time, the magistrate judge concluded that counsel "was effective under *Strickland*" because Van Patten had not shown that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's error. Magistrate Judge's Order (Rec. 28) at 3, Pet. at A38-39.

certificate of appealability. Rec. 39. Along with his answer, he also submitted several letters and requested the appointment of counsel.[2] One of these letters—sent during the period between the plea hearing and the sentencing—was addressed to an attorney whom Van Patten had first contacted months earlier. Pet. at A31. As the district court noted, Van Patten's letter sought the attorney's guidance and complained that he "could see [he] wasn't getting anywhere" with his current attorneys, who had "forced [him] into a plea * * *." *Ibid.*

The district court denied Van Patten's petition. Pet. at A25-A35. After considering both the recommendation by the magistrate judge and the various pleadings and additional documentary evidence submitted by Van Patten, the court concluded that Van Patten "ha[d] not demonstrated that he contacted counsel about withdrawing his plea or that he told the judge during sentencing that he wanted to withdraw his plea." Pet. at A33. The court further concluded that the state court's finding that Van Patten "only sought to withdraw [the plea] after he was sentenced" was a "credibility determination which has not been rebutted." *Id.*. Thus the district court concluded that Van Patten had not proven

---

[2] Later, Van Patten also filed a "supplemental," which referred to a state disciplinary action against an attorney who had been appointed to represent him in the federal habeas proceedings. Rec. 44. The "supplemental" also argued that Van Patten or his new counsel should have the opportunity to admit certain evidence that his appointed habeas counsel had failed to submit, including the letters he had already submitted as "proof of contact" with other attorneys concerning his plea. *Ibid.*

ineffective assistance of counsel under *Strickland*. It also held that the state court "properly identified and applied *Strickland* as the proper legal standard governing Van Patten's ineffective assistance claim." *Id.* at 33-34.

At the same time, the district court concluded that Van Patten's counsel was "ineffective under *Cronic*." *Id.* at 34. Without any further analysis, however, the district court accepted the magistrate judge's conclusion that "trial counsel's appearance by telephone was a harmless error even though it was a violation of Van Patten's Sixth Amendment right of effective assistance of counsel." *Ibid.* On this basis, the court denied Van Patten's petition. Pet. at A34-35.

C. Seventh Circuit Decision

The Seventh Circuit reversed. The Court recognized that a defendant has a right to an attorney's "guiding hand" during a proceeding in which he enters a guilty or "no contest" plea because such a proceeding is a critical stage where defenses may be irretrievably lost if not asserted. Pet. at A17 (quoting *Hamilton* v. *Alabama*, 368 U.S. 52 (1961)). The court also held that the right of an accused to be represented by counsel at such a hearing is "pervasive for it affects his ability to assert any other rights he may have." *Id.* (quoting *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 654).

Having established the importance of the Sixth Amendment right at the plea hearing, the court then considered whether the claim in this case is governed by *Strickland* or *Cronic*. Pet. at A17-A19. The court concluded that Van Patten's claim was based on a structural defect in the design of the proceeding

rather than any specific legal judgment or incorrect information his attorney provided. *Id.* The nature of communication over speakerphone deprived Van Patten of his attorney's guidance and support; he could not turn to his lawyer for private advice, and the lawyer was not in a position to detect and respond to non-verbal cues from his client regarding misunderstandings or a change of heart. *Id.* at A18. In short, the court concluded that the structural limitations and surrounding circumstances deprived Van Patten of the assistance of counsel at a critical stage in the proceedings—a claim that must be analyzed under *Cronic*. By applying *Strickland* and requiring prejudice, the state court had reached a decision contrary to clearly established federal law.

Having found a *Cronic* violation, the Seventh Circuit then concluded that the district court had erred in finding the error to be harmless. *Id.* at A23. The court held that harmless error analysis is inapplicable "where the denial of counsel contaminated the entire proceeding." *Id.* at A23 (citing cases). Thus the court reversed the district court's decision and remanded with instructions to grant the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. *Id.* at A24. The court further instructed that when the case returned to the state trial court, the proceedings could proceed "with a plea of not guilty in place." *Ibid.*

Petitioner's predecessor did not seek a stay of the mandate from the Seventh Circuit. Nevertheless (and despite Van Patten's right to a speedy trial), the state prosecutors have asked the trial judge to delay the trial pending final resolution of this matter. Jeffrey P. Endicott, warden of Redgranite Correctional Institution and the respondent-appellee

in the Seventh Circuit, has since transferred custody of Van Patten to Shawano County Sheriff Randall Wright. Today—more than a year and a half since the Seventh Circuit's mandate issued and the petition for habeas corpus was granted by the federal district court—Van Patten remains in custody and still has not been granted a trial on the claims against him.

D. United States Supreme Court Order

While Petitioner's original petition for certiorari was pending, this Court considered and decided *Musladin*, another case addressing a claim under Section 2254. Immediately after issuing that decision, the Court granted Petitioner's petition, vacated the Seventh Circuit's decision, and remanded the instant case (along with one other) for further consideration in light of its decision in *Musladin*.

In *Musladin*, this Court vacated a decision by the Ninth Circuit holding that a criminal defendant was entitled to relief under Section 2254. The petitioner in *Musladin* challenged his murder conviction on the ground that his trial was inherently unfair because spectators in the courtroom were wearing buttons bearing the victim's image. Because this Court's cases had never addressed the significance of *spectator* courtroom conduct (as opposed to state-sponsored conduct) on a defendant's right to a fair trial, this Court determined it was an "open question" in this Court's jurisprudence for purposes of Section 2254. 127 S. Ct. at 653 (stating "[i]n contrast to state-sponsored courtroom practices, the effect on a defendant's fair-trial rights of the spectator conduct to which Musladin objects is an open question in our jurisprudence"). Thus, the Court concluded, the

Ninth Circuit erred in holding that Musladin was entitled to habeas relief under Section 2254, which allows relief only when the state courts reached a decision that is "contrary to," or an unreasonable application of, "clearly established" federal law. *Ibid.*

E. The Seventh Circuit's Decision on Remand

As provided by the Seventh Circuit's local rules, Petitioner and Van Patten each submitted statements of position on remand. Petitioner's statement of position again described the issue in terms of whether *Strickland*, rather than *Cronic*, properly governed the state court's analysis of the claim. According to Petitioner's submission, "[n]o holding of [the] [Supreme] Court required the [Wisconsin] Court of Appeal[s] to apply" *United States* v. *Cronic* rather than *Strickland* v. *Washington* to Van Patten's claim that by appearing telephonically rather than it person at the change-of-plea hearing, defense counsel provided ineffective assistance." State's Cir. R. 54 Statement at 4 (quoting *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 654 (alteration in original)).

The Seventh Circuit issued a new, published decision (with one judge dissenting) in which it concluded that its original decision should be reinstated. According to the Seventh Circuit, "[n]othing in *Musladin* requires that our 2006 opinion be changed." Pet. at A2. The court explained that "[u]nlike *Musladin*, this case does not concern an open constitutional question. The Supreme Court has long recognized a defendant's right to relief if his defense counsel was actually or constructively absent at a critical stage of the proceedings." *Ibid.* The

Seventh Circuit further stated that "[n]either § 2254 nor *Musladin* limits relief to the precise factual situations addressed in the Supreme Court's previous cases. The technology employed in taking Van Patten's no contest plea (the use of a speakerphone) may have been novel, but the legal principle presented by the case was not." *Ibid.*

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION

As discussed further below, the petition fails to satisfy any of this Court's usual criteria for granting review. Petitioner has not cited any conflicting decisions by any other federal court of appeals—either on the specific right-to-counsel question presented here or on the broader question of the standards to be applied in analyzing a state court's decision under Section 2254. There is also no conflict between the Seventh Circuit's decision and the relevant decisions of this Court. Petitioner incorrectly suggests that the reinstated Seventh Circuit decision ignores this Court's decision in *Musladin*. On the contrary, the Seventh Circuit explicitly noted that "[n]othing in *Musladin* requires that our 2006 opinion be changed." Pet. at A2. *Musladin* exemplified, but did not fundamentally alter, this Court's analysis of Section 2254 claims. And whereas the Court in *Musladin* held that habeas relief was unavailable because the case before the state courts had involved an open constitutional question, no such open question is implicated here. The right to counsel is among our most well-established rights, and this Court long ago prescribed the analysis that should apply to claims based on specific errors by counsel *(Strickland)* and to those based on the actual or constructive denial of counsel *(Cronic)*. Thus there can be no doubt that the law

applicable to this case was clearly established in this Court's jurisprudence.

To be sure, this Court has not had the opportunity to address specifically whether "speakerphone assistance of counsel fits within a *Cronic* exception." Pet. at 19. But nothing in Section 2254 limits this Court's decisions to their specific facts. Here, the Seventh Circuit properly concluded that the state court had reached a decision "contrary to" this Court's cases by analyzing the claim under *Strickland* rather than under *Cronic*. Nothing in the habeas statute precluded the Seventh Circuit from deciding that the facts of this case were materially indistinguishable from those in *Cronic* and its progeny.

Nor is the Seventh Circuit's decision inconsistent with this Court's cases involving plea hearings. This Court has never held that right-to-counsel cases involving plea hearings *must* be analyzed under *Strickland*. To the contrary, this Court has often recognized that a plea hearing or arraignment is a "critical stage" of the proceedings and that the actual or constructive denial of counsel at such a hearing would be presumptively prejudicial under *Cronic*.

Petitioner is also incorrect in claiming that the Seventh Circuit substituted its own factual determinations for those of the state courts. The Seventh Circuit's conclusions were in no way inconsistent with the Wisconsin court's factual findings. Further, the state findings Petitioner cites primarily concern whether Van Patten suffered actual prejudice, which is irrelevant under *Cronic*. Thus a decision by this Court on that fact-bound

issue would have no impact at all, even on the judgment in this case.

The notion that counsel should be physically present when his client is pleading guilty is not a new idea. A defendant who is forced to stand alone in the courtroom—without a lawyer at his side to answer questions, observe his demeanor, and assess personally whether the plea is knowing and voluntary—should not be denied relief on the ground that no lawyer has ever tried such a thing before. The Seventh Circuit's decision in this case fell well within the bounds of Section 2254, even as interpreted by *Musladin*. The petition should be denied.

I. The petition fails to identify any conflicts among the Circuits or with any relevant decision of this Court with regard to the scope of Section 2254.

Tellingly, Petitioner does not allege any conflict between the Seventh Circuit's decision and a decision by any of the other federal courts of appeals. Nor has Petitioner demonstrated any genuine conflict between the Seventh Circuit's decision and decisions of this Court. Thus this case fails to present the most basic criteria that this Court uses to determine whether to exercise its certiorari jurisdiction.

This case does not present a conflict with this Court's decision in *Musladin*. That decision exemplifies, but does not fundamentally change, the standard for assessing "clearly established Federal law" under Section 2254. The petitioner in *Musladin* claimed that his trial was unfair because spectators in the courtroom were wearing buttons bearing the

image of the victim. This Court held that he was not entitled to relief under Section 2254 because there was no "clearly established Federal law" addressing the constitutional significance of conduct by courtroom spectators. While this Court had previously addressed claims based on state-sponsored courtroom practices, the effect of conduct by *spectators* was "an open question" in the Court's jurisprudence. *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 653. Moreover, this Court's framework for addressing state-sponsored courtroom conduct affirmatively suggested that it did *not* apply to spectator conduct, as it specifically included a component addressing whether the practices furthered an essential state interest. *See id.* at 654.

Unlike *Musladin*, this case does not concern an open constitutional question. This Court has long recognized a defendant's right to relief if his defense counsel was actually or constructively absent at a critical stage of the proceedings. *See Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 659-60; *Powell* v. *Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45, 53 (1932) (holding that the defendant requires the "guiding hand" of counsel through every stage of the proceedings against him); *Hamilton* v. *Alabama*, 368 U.S. 52, 55 (1961) (recognizing that the "guiding hand of counsel" is necessary where criminal defendant is "arraigned without having counsel at his side"); *White* v. *Maryland*, 373 U.S. 59, 60 (1963) (holding the absence of counsel at a preliminary hearing required the defendant's conviction to be reversed and stating "[o]nly the presence of counsel could have enabled this accused to know all the defenses available to him and to plead intelligently"). The Supreme Court has set out a basic analysis to govern most claims of attorney error—the two-pronged

analysis in *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 687, which requires both an error by counsel and proof that the error was prejudicial. But the Court has also held that the "[a]ctual or constructive denial of the assistance of counsel altogether" requires a different analysis and "is legally presumed to result in prejudice." *Id.* at 692 (citing *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 659 & n.25, issued on the same day as *Strickland*).

The fact that this Court's cases have not applied those principles in this precise factual scenario does not create an open constitutional question. Petitioner argues that because this Court has never addressed the precise factual issue in this case—defense counsel's appearance at a plea hearing via speakerphone—the courts lacked a clear statement of the relevant law to apply. *See* Pet. at 17 ("Without a clear statement from this Court, the Seventh Circuit lacked authority under the AEDPA to grant habeas relief here, and the court should not have done so.") (citing *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 654). But the result in *Musladin* did not turn on the fact that the Court had never addressed a case involving buttons that bore the image of the victim. Rather, this Court found a *categorical* limitation in its cases, holding that the constitutional significance of *spectator* conduct – as opposed to *state-sponsored* conduct – was an "open question" in the Court's jurisprudence. By contrast, the right to the presence of counsel at a plea hearing is simply not an open question.

As this Court has explained, "[c]learly established Federal law" under Section 2254(d)(1) "is the governing legal principle or principles set forth by the Supreme Court at the time the state court renders its decision." *Lockyer* v. *Andrade*, 538 U.S. 63, 71-72 (2003). A legal principle that is both "clear" and

"established" may also cover various factual situations. That a case enunciating the relevant legal principle contains different facts from a subsequent case does not remove the clarity of the legal principle stated. *Ibid.* (despite its fact-intensive nature, the "gross disproportionality" principle and its applicability to sentences for terms of years was "clearly established"); *see also Williams* v. *Taylor*, 529 U.S. 362, 391 (2000) (the case-by-case examination required by *Strickland* "obviates neither the clarity of the rule nor the extent to which the rule must be seen as 'established'"); *id* at 382 (Stevens, J., concurring) (noting that legal principles are clear for purposes of habeas review "even when they are expressed in terms of a generalized standard rather than as a bright-line rule"); *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 656 ("While general rules tend to accord courts 'more leeway' * * * in reaching outcomes in case-by-case determinations,' *Yarborough v. Alvarado*, 541 U.S. 652, 124 S. Ct. 2140, 158 L.Ed.2d 938 (2004) (plurality opinion), AEDPA does not require state and federal courts to wait for some nearly identical factual pattern before a legal rule must be applied.") (Kennedy, J., concurring opinion) (citing *Wright* v. *West*, 505 U.S. 277 (1992) (Kennedy, J., concurring in judgment)).[3]

---

[3] Justice Stevens, writing for three other justices, has highlighted the inappropriateness of an argument similar to what Petitioner now advances. Requiring decisions to match both legally and factually before there is a "clearly established" rule creates an absurd result. Under this logic even *Strickland* would not be clearly established for purposes of an ineffective assistance of counsel claim, "since that case, which established the 'controlling' rule of law on the issue, contained facts insufficient to show ineffectiveness." *Williams*, 529 U.S. at 377 n.9 (Stevens, J., concurring).

Thus a state court decision is "contrary to" Supreme Court precedent if the state court "applies a rule that contradicts the governing law set forth in [Supreme Court] cases" *or* "confronts a set of facts that are materially indistinguishable from a decision of this Court and nevertheless arrives at a result different from [Supreme Court] precedent." *Williams*, 529 U.S. at 405-406. "[F]actual contexts of cases may be regarded as 'materially indistinguishable,' because their legal implications clearly are the same, notwithstanding that the facts themselves are significantly different." 2 RANDY HERTZ & JAMES S. LIEBNAM, FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS PRAC. & PROC. 1594 n.24 (5th ed. 2005); *Ramdass* v. *Angelone*, 530 U.S. 156, 180 (2000) (O'Connor, J., concurring) (providing an example of factually disparate situations that could be understood as "materially indistinguishable").

Petitioner's position on this issue is undercut by its citations to *Kane* v. *Garcia Espitia*, 126 S. Ct. 407 (2005) and *Lockyer* v. *Andrade*, 538 U.S. 63 (2003). In *Kane*, this Court considered whether it was clearly established that a pro se defendant had a right to access a law library to prepare his defense. The Court specifically noted that "federal appellate courts have split on whether *Faretta* [v. *California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975)], which establishes a Sixth Amendment right to self-representation, implies a right of the *pro se* defendant to have access to a law library." 126 S. Ct. at 408 (per curiam). As evidenced by the circuit split, there was no clearly established right to access to a law library at that time, and the Supreme Court refused to "imply" such a right in a habeas proceeding. *Id.* Here, by contrast, it is the factual scenario—not the right itself—that was "novel."

Unlike in *Kane*, there is no serious debate here about whether the Constitution guarantees the right to have counsel present and in a position to provide advice, support, and zealous advocacy as the defendant enters a plea and thereby surrenders his constitutional rights. The fact that this particular defendant was denied the assistance of counsel in a new and unique way does not mean that his rights were not "clearly established."

Petitioner's citation to *Lockyer* fares no better. This Court acknowledged in *Lockyer* that its Eighth Amendment jurisprudence was neither "clear" nor "consistent" regarding what factors should be considered in determining whether a sentence was "grossly disproportionate." 538 U.S. at 72. And the Court cited numerous opinions that directly pointed out its lack of clarity in this area—a lack of clarity that made the state court's resolution of the issue a reasonable choice based on the established law at the time of its decision. *Id.* at 72-73.[4] In contrast, there is no lack of clarity with the *Strickland* and *Cronic* decisions. This Court has held that the absence or constructive absence of counsel from a plea hearing is presumptively prejudicial, and the fact that it has not applied that standard to precisely these facts is not a bar to relief.

In sum, as the Seventh Circuit recognized, "[n]either §2254 nor *Musladin* limits relief to the precise factual situations addressed in the Supreme Court's previous cases. The technology employed in taking Van Patten's no contest plea (the use of a

---

[4] As noted above, in spite of this lack of clarity, this Court did find its general disproportionality principle to be "clearly established [Federal] law." *Lockyer*, 538 U.S. at 73.

speakerphone) may have been novel, but the legal principle presented by the case was not." 489 F.3d at 828. This approach to Section 2254 is entirely consistent with this Court's cases and requires no further review.

II. The Seventh Circuit's decision does not conflict with decisions of this Court in respect to the standard to be applied to right-to-counsel cases in plea hearings.

Petitioner's suggestion that this Court has held that *Strickland* always applies to right-to-counsel claims in plea hearings is simply incorrect. Petitioner argues that *Hill* v. *Lockhart*, 474 U.S. 52 (1985) requires courts to apply *Strickland* to all ineffective assistance claims relating to guilty or no contest pleas. Pet. at 15 ("On the other hand, in *Hill*, this Court explicitly held that *Strickland* applies to claims of ineffective assistance occurring in a change of plea hearing.") (citation omitted). This is a misreading of *Hill* and of this Court's cases generally.

Whether *Strickland* applies rather than *Cronic* turns on the nature of the right-to-counsel claim, not the particular proceeding in which the claim arose. Moreover, "[f]or purposes of distinguishing between the rule of *Strickland* and that of *Cronic*, this difference is not of degree [of the error] but of kind." *Bell* v. *Cone*, 535 U.S. 685, 697 (2002). This Court issued its decisions in *Strickland* and *Cronic* on the same day, creating two different regimes for Sixth Amendment cases. In cases where counsel committed a specific error in the representation, this Court requires the defendant to show that the error "actually had an adverse effect on the defense." *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 693. As the Court has

explained, "[a]ttorney errors come in an infinite variety and are as likely to be utterly harmless in a particular case as they are to be prejudicial." 466 U.S. at 693; *see also id.* at 702 (Brennan, J., concurring) (*Strickland's* prejudice analysis applies to "claims of ineffective assistance based on allegations of specific errors by counsel—claims which, by their very nature, require courts to evaluate both the attorney's performance and the effect of that performance on the reliability and fairness of the proceeding") (citations omitted).

In some cases, however—including where counsel is absent during a critical stage of the proceedings—prejudice to the defendant is presumed. *Id.* at 692 ("Actual or constructive denial of the assistance of counsel altogether is legally presumed to result in prejudice. So are various kinds of state interference with counsel's assistance.") (citing *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 659 & n.25). In such cases, prejudice to the defendant "is so likely that case-by-case inquiry into prejudice is not worth the cost." *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 692 (citing *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 658). This analysis applies not only when counsel was completely absent but also when "the surrounding circumstances made it so unlikely that any lawyer could provide effective assistance that ineffectiveness was properly presumed without inquiry into actual performance at trial." *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 661.

The Court elaborated on this reasoning in *Cronic* by describing several instances in which prejudice need not be evaluated, including when counsel is "either totally absent, or prevented from assisting the accused during a critical stage of the proceeding." 466 U.S. at 659 & n.25. Such cases suffer from "'constitutional error of the first magnitude and no

amount of showing of want of prejudice would cure it.'" *Id.* at 659 (quoting *Davis* v. *Alaska*, 415 U.S. 308, 318 (1974)). Among the examples cited in *Cronic* itself was *Hamilton* v. *Alabama*, 368 U.S. 52 (1961), in which the Court held that a conviction must be reversed when the defendant was denied counsel at an arraignment because—even though the defendant did not plead guilty—an arraignment or plea hearing is a proceeding where available defenses or other rights might be irretrievably lost. *Id.* (citing *Hamilton*, 368 U.S. at 55); *accord Iowa* v. *Tovar*, 541 U.S. 77, 81 (2004) ("[t]he entry of a guilty plea . . . ranks as a 'critical stage' at which the right to counsel adheres") (citing *White* v. *Maryland*, 373 U.S. 59, 60 (1963)); *Bell*, 535 U.S. at 695-96 (proceedings are "presumptively unfair" if the accused "is denied the presence of counsel at 'a critical stage,'" a phrase used "in *Hamilton* v. *Alabama* and *White* v. *Maryland* to denote a step of a criminal proceeding, such as arraignment, that held significant consequences for the accused") (citations omitted); *accord Childress* v. *Johnson*, 103 F.3d 1221, 1231-1232 (5th Cir. 1997) (applying *Cronic* and granting a writ of habeas corpus under Section 2254 when defense counsel functioned as the equivalent to standby counsel at a plea hearing).

Against this backdrop, the Court's decision in *Hill*—which Petitioner repeatedly invokes in its petition—obviously does not require application of *Strickland* in every right-to-counsel case that relates to a plea hearing.[5] Although *Hill* did involve a plea

---

[5] Petitioner's suggestion that counsel's presence is not necessary at a plea hearing because it is "nonadversarial" in the same sense as a trial is bizarre and unfounded. Pet. at 18-19. A defendant's right to counsel is not limited to proceedings in

hearing, it did not concern either the absence of counsel or a structural defect in the proceedings that prevented counsel from providing adequate representation to his client. To the contrary, the defendant's claim was that the attorney—who was present the entire time—made specific mistakes, including in his advice regarding the timing of the defendant's parole eligibility. 474 U.S. at 60. It was these specific errors that the *Hill* Court subjected to the prejudice requirement in *Strickland*.

Indeed, *Hill* itself echoed the reasoning the Court gave for the prejudice requirement in *Strickland*. The Court's decision in *Hill* explains that the prejudice analysis is fraught with difficulty because errors by counsel "come in an infinite variety" and "cannot be classified according to likelihood of causing prejudice." 474 U.S. at 57-58. These "errors" are often strategic decisions. Whether any specific act or omission is strategic or inappropriate is difficult to determine. "Representation is an art, and an act or omission that is unprofessional in one case may be sound or even brilliant in another." *Id.* at 58. Accordingly, the "additional 'prejudice' requirement [from *Strickland*] was based on [a] conclusion that '[an] error by counsel, even if professionally unreasonable, does not warrant setting aside the judgment of a criminal proceeding if the error had no effect on the judgment.'" *Id.* at 57. Thus *Hill* too

---

which there will be cross-examination of witnesses. Indeed, it is simply incorrect to suggest that it is "not even clearly established that *Cronic* applies at all in the context of a guilty or no-contest plea" (Pet. at 19), given that *Cronic* itself cited *Hamilton*—a plea hearing case—as an example of precisely the circumstance in which the Court would not stop to assess prejudice. 466 U.S. at 659 n.25.

makes clear that the prejudice requirement is designed to address specific errors or mistakes by counsel.

Here, the Seventh Circuit concluded that Van Patten's claim did not present the sort of specific error or mistake that must be assessed under *Strickland*. Rather, the court held that the unique circumstances of Van Patten's plea hearing amounted to the denial of counsel altogether. As this Court held in *Cronic*, the prejudice requirement does not apply when counsel was absent or when the surrounding circumstances were such that no lawyer could have provided adequate representation. 466 U.S. at 656 n.16.

Van Patten stood alone in the courtroom before the judge and prosecutor. He could not turn to his lawyer for a private discussion or to share any last-minute misgivings or concerns about the plea. His lawyer was not in a position to observe his demeanor or to detect non-verbal clues about whether Van Patten was confused about something or was having second thoughts. No one had asked Van Patten's consent to proceed in this fashion, and no arrangements had been made in advance for him to be able to consult with his counsel privately during the hearing. The judge's suggestion that a private consultation could "perhaps" be provided did little to solve the problem here. Indeed, it put the burden on Van Patten to make a special request for such a consultation from the judge whom he anticipated would be imposing his sentence. For all these reasons, the circumstances of this hearing were such that the likelihood of "effective assistance" was "so small that a presumption of prejudice is appropriate." *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 659-60.

As the Seventh Circuit noted, Van Patten's claim was focused on a structural problem with the representation, not on a specific legal judgment that could be evaluated under *Strickland*. The court noted, for example, that Van Patten had not complained "that his attorney botched his defense through bad legal judgments, or misinformed him of the ramifications of his plea." Pet. at A9. The specifics of counsel's performance were "beside the point if the attorney is prevented by the design of the proceeding from providing the full benefit of his skills when his client needs them most." *Id.* Thus this is a *Cronic* case, and Van Patten is entitled to relief without first having to establish that counsel's absence caused him specific prejudice. The state court's decision was contrary to Supreme Court precedent in that it chose to evaluate Van Patten's claim under *Strickland* instead. *See Williams*, 529 U.S. at 397-98 (state court decision may be "contrary to" Supreme Court precedent if the state court chooses the wrong legal rule to apply to the facts of a particular case before it).[6]

---

[6] The question presented in the petition—like Petitioner's position on remand—focuses on whether the state court rendered a decision "contrary to" clearly established law by choosing *Strickland*, rather than *Cronic*, to analyze the claim in this case. To the extent that Petitioner is also arguing that counsel's appearance by speakerphone does not, in fact, constitute a complete or constructive denial of counsel under the particular analysis provided in *Cronic*, that issue would not implicate Section 2254 at all. As noted above, the state courts did not analyze the facts here under *Cronic*, and thus the federal courts were not obliged to defer to any state court legal determination regarding whether counsel's failure to appear in person was, or was not, an actual or constructive denial of counsel at a critical stage of the proceedings. Moreover, the conclusions by both the district court and the Seventh Circuit

III. The Seventh Circuit did not substitute its own factual conclusions for those of the state courts.

Petitioner's arguments about the Seventh Circuit's factual discussion also provide no basis for a grant of certiorari here. The particular factual conclusions made by the state courts—and the supposed relationship between these facts and the Seventh Circuit's more general discussion of the hazards of an attorney's attempting to represent a criminal defendant by speakerphone—are of no significance beyond the instant case and do not implicate any larger legal questions under Section 2254.

Moreover, the state court factual determinations to which Petitioner refers relate generally to whether Van Patten could demonstrate prejudice or could defend against a harmless error analysis. *See e.g.*, Pet. at 24-25 (discussing state court's credibility determination concerning whether Van Patten grew concerned about and attempted to withdraw his plea before or after sentencing). But as the Seventh Circuit held, neither prejudice analysis nor harmless error analysis is appropriate here in the first place, as a matter of law. Thus the Seventh Circuit's analysis in no way intruded on the state court's findings—and even if it had, that issue would have no impact on the judgment here.

---

that counsel was "ineffective under *Cronic*" are fact-bound and (one hopes) are based on a situation that is unlikely to recur. Under the facts presented here, counsel's participation by speakerphone was not authorized by the relevant state statutes and—for all the reasons discussed by the Seventh Circuit—put the lawyer in a position where he could not possibly render effective representation to his client.

For example, Petitioner claims that the Wisconsin trial court held that Van Patten would have entered the same plea had counsel properly appeared. Pet. at 24-25. Rather than make a factual determination on whether Van Patten can prove actual prejudice, however, the Seventh Circuit correctly noted that where counsel is constructively absent from the proceedings, prejudice is presumed. Pet. at A19 (citing, *inter alia, White*, 373 U.S. at 60 (noting that "when [a] defendant enters a plea outside the presence of counsel, "we do not stop to determine whether prejudice resulted: 'only the presence of counsel could have enabled [the] accused to know all the defenses available to him and to plead intelligently'")). Thus when the court stated that it "cannot know what Van Patten might have done had he been treated like any other defendant with counsel at his side" (Pet. at A19), that was obviously a comment on why prejudice is not required—not a conclusion that the state court was wrong in finding the prejudice requirement unsatisfied on this record.

Next Petitioner takes issue with the Seventh Circuit's assertion that "[i]f Van Patten wished to converse with his attorney, anyone else in the courtroom could effectively eavesdrop." Pet. at 25 (citing Pet. at A18). But this observation—based on common sense and the plea hearing transcript itself—does not conflict with any factual finding by the state courts. Indeed, Petitioner does not identify any state court factual finding on this subject at all. Pet. at 25-26 (citing testimony rather than state court decisions). Furthermore, the Seventh Circuit's recounting of the events of the plea hearing does not contradict anything in the record. The Seventh Circuit did nothing more than recite the fact that Van

Patten's counsel was using a speakerphone and that Van Patten could only have a private conversation if he made a special request to the trial judge. Pet. at A18 (recounting the proceedings described in Pl. Hrg. 6); *see also supra* Part I.A.

Finally, although Petitioner repeatedly asserts the Seventh Circuit relied on "debatable inferences," it is unclear what these supposedly "debatable inferences" were. The Seventh Circuit simply discussed the practical implications of having counsel participate in a hearing by speakerphone. Pet. at A18, A21-22 (commenting that an attorney participating by speakerphone might not be paying attention, might not be in a able to share crucial information with his client, is not available for private consultation, and would not be in a position to observe the defendant's demeanor and clues about his level of understanding). And in any event, these fact-specific and case-specific questions provide no basis for further review in this Court.

CONCLUSION

This Court's intervention is not required here. The Seventh Circuit's decision does not present any unresolved issue of law, and Petitioner has not demonstrated any conflict of authority among the Circuits or with any decision of this Court. The petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted.

LINDA T. COBERLY
Counsel of Record
JUSTIN E. ENDRES
MATTHEW J. HERNANDEZ
Winston & Strawn LLP
35 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 558-5600

October 2007

REPLY BRIEF

71

(3)

No. 07-212

FILED
OCT 30 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

RANDALL WRIGHT, Sheriff,
Shawano County, Wisconsin,
Petitioner,

v.

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

J.B. VAN HOLLEN
Attorney General of Wisconsin

CHRISTOPHER G. WREN
Assistant Attorney General
Counsel of Record

Wisconsin Department of Justice
Post Office Box 7857
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857
(608) 266-7081

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. THIS COURT'S REVIEW OF VIOLATIONS OF AEDPA STANDARDS DOES NOT DEPEND ON A SPLIT AMONG THE CIRCUITS OR ON A DIRECT CONFLICT WITH THIS COURT'S DECISIONS. 2

II. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE AEDPA'S STANDARDS FOR REVIEWING A STATE COURT'S ADJUDICATION IN A CRIMINAL CASE. 5

III. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT FAILED TO ACCORD AEDPA DEFERENCE TO THE FACTS FOUND IN THE WISCONSIN STATE COURTS 8

CONCLUSION 10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Bell v. Cone,
535 U.S. 685 (2002) 2

Bradshaw v. Richey,
546 U.S. 74 (2005) (*per curiam*) 2

Carey v. Musladin,
549 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 649 (2006) ..... *passim*

Estelle v. Williams,
425 U.S. 501 (1976) 3

Early v. Packer,
537 U.S. 3 (2002) (*per curiam*) 2

Hill v. Lockhart,
474 U.S. 52 (1985) 4

Holbrook v. Flynn,
475 U.S. 560 (1986) 3

Holland v. Jackson,
542 U.S. 649 (2004) (*per curiam*) 2

Middleton v. McNeil,
541 U.S. 433 (2004) (*per curiam*) 2

Mitchell v. Esparza,
540 U.S. 12 (2003) (*per curiam*) 2

Powell v. Alabama,
287 U.S. 45 (1932) 7

Rice v. Collins,
546 U.S. 333 (2006) 2, 9

Schriro v. Landrigan,
127 S. Ct. 1933 (2007) 2

Strickland v. Washington,
466 U.S. 668 (1984) ..... *passim*

United States v. Cronic,
466 U.S. 648 (1984) ..... *passim*

Van Patten v. Deppisch,
434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006), *vacated sub nom. Schmidt v. Van Patten*, 127 S. Ct. 1120, *reinstated by Van Patten v. Endicott*, 489 F.3d 827 (7th Cir. 2007) 3, 4

Woodford v. Visciotti,
537 U.S. 19 (2002) (*per curiam*) 2

STATUTES

Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), Pub. L. 104-132, § 104, 110 Stat. 1214, 1219 (codified at 28 U.S.C. § 2254) ..... *passim*

28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1) 9

No. 07-212

In the Supreme Court of the United States

RANDALL WRIGHT, Sheriff,
Shawano County, Wisconsin,
Petitioner,

v.

JOSEPH L. VAN PATTEN,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

In accord with *Carey v. Musladin*, 549 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 649 (2006), the AEDPA[1] prohibited the Seventh Circuit from holding in this case that Wisconsin state courts had an obligation to apply the one-part "deficient performance" test of *United States v. Cronic*, 466 U.S. 648 (1984), rather than the two-part "deficient performance

[1] Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), Pub. L. 104-132, § 104, 110 Stat. 1214, 1219 (codified at 28 U.S.C. § 2254).

and consequent prejudice" test of *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984). In *Musladin*, this Court declared that under the AEDPA, unless a "holding of this Court require[s]" a State court to apply the test of a particular decision of this Court, "the state court's decision was not contrary to or an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law." *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 654. Neither *Strickland* nor *Cronic* (nor any other decision of this Court) required the Wisconsin state courts to apply *Cronic* rather than *Strickland* to Van Patten's ineffective-assistance claim.

I. THIS COURT'S REVIEW OF VIOLATIONS OF AEDPA STANDARDS DOES NOT DEPEND ON A SPLIT AMONG THE CIRCUITS OR ON A DIRECT CONFLICT WITH THIS COURT'S DECISIONS.

Van Patten urges denial of the petition because the circuits have not split on the legal issue and the Seventh Circuit's decision does not directly conflict with decisions of this Court (Br. in Opp. 15-21).

This Court has repeatedly granted certiorari when federal courts of appeals have declined to abide by the AEDPA's limitations — regardless of whether the circuits have split on the underlying legal issue. *See, e.g., Schriro v. Landrigan*, 127 S. Ct. 1933 (2007); *Rice v. Collins*, 546 U.S. 333 (2006); *Bradshaw v. Richey*, 546 U.S. 74 (2005) (*per curiam*); *Holland v. Jackson*, 542 U.S. 649 (2004) (*per curiam*); *Middleton v. McNeil*, 541 U.S. 433 (2004) (*per curiam*); *Mitchell v. Esparza*, 540 U.S. 12 (2003) (*per curiam*); *Woodford v. Visciotti*, 537 U.S. 19 (2002) (*per curiam*); *Early v. Packer*, 537 U.S. 3 (2002) (*per curiam*); *Bell v. Cone*, 535 U.S. 685 (2002).

The AEDPA creates a highly deferential standard for federal review of State-level criminal convictions and fur-

ther identifies this Court's interpretations of federal law as the benchmarks for implementing that standard. Here, especially after *Musladin*, the Seventh Circuit substantially disregarded the strict standards of the AEDPA. By itself, that disregard warrants this Court's review.

In addition, the Seventh Circuit decision suffers from the same defect as the Ninth Circuit decision underlying *Musladin*: failure to stay within the narrow confines of the "clearly established" standard under the AEDPA. In *Musladin*, this Court identified the underlying "clearly established" principle: "This Court has recognized that certain courtroom practices are so inherently prejudicial that they deprive the defendant of a fair trial. *Estelle v. Williams*, 425 U.S. 501 (1976); *Holbrook v. Flynn*, 475 U.S. 560 (1986)." *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 651. In vacating the Ninth Circuit's decision, *id.* at 652, this Court noted that *Williams* and *Flynn* "dealt with government-sponsored practices," *id.* at 653. "In contrast to state-sponsored courtroom practices, the effect on a defendant's fair-trial rights of the spectator conduct to which Musladin objects is an open question in our jurisprudence. This Court has never addressed a claim that such private-actor courtroom conduct was so inherently prejudicial that it deprived a defendant of a fair trial. . . . . [W]e have never applied that test to spectators' conduct." *Id.* at 653-54 (footnote omitted).

Similarly, in *Van Patten v. Deppisch*, 434 F.3d 1038 (7th Cir. 2006), *vacated sub nom. Schmidt v. Van Patten*, 127 S. Ct. 1120, *reinstated by Van Patten v. Endicott*, 489 F.3d 827 (7th Cir. 2007), a "clearly established" principle existed: a criminal defendant's right to the effective assistance of counsel at critical stages of a criminal proceeding. This Court's decisions also "clearly established" that absent an actual or constructive denial of counsel, *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 659 & n.25, a defendant claiming ineffective assistance must prove both that counsel performed deficiently and that counsel's deficient performance caused

the defendant prejudice, *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 687. To adapt *Musladin* to this case, "[A] state court held that [defense counsel's telephonic assistance to Van Patten at his change-of-plea hearing] did not deny [Van Patten] his right to [the effective assistance of counsel under *Strickland*]. [This Court] must decide whether that holding was contrary to or an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law, as determined by this Court."

Van Patten claims that *Musladin* concerned an error in categorization and that this case does not (Br. in Opp. 17). This case requires review precisely because it presents an even more egregious categorical error under the AEDPA. In *Musladin*, the Ninth Circuit relied on precedent from this Court establishing that courtroom practices could violate a defendant's right to a fair trial. The Ninth Circuit erred by erroneously extending those precedents to a category of courtroom conduct that "this Court has never addressed." In *Van Patten*, 434 F.3d 1038, the Seventh Circuit did not have *any* decisions from this Court "clearly establishing" that courts should categorize telephonic assistance of counsel as deficient performance in all circumstances, much less any decisions "clearly establishing" telephonic assistance as deficient performance creating in all circumstances an irrebuttable presumption of prejudice. The Wisconsin Court of Appeals, by contrast, invoked this Court's decision in *Hill v. Lockhart*, 474 U.S. 52 (1985), which "clearly established" the applicability of *Strickland* to claims (like Van Patten's) of ineffective assistance of counsel at a change-of-plea hearing.

To adapt *Musladin* again, "Given the lack of holdings from this Court regarding the [application of either *Strickland* or *Cronic* to a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel arising from counsel's actively engaged assistance provided via an uninterrupted telephonic connection during a change-of-plea hearing], it cannot be said that the state court 'unreasonabl[y] appli[ed] clearly established

Federal law.' § 2254(d)(1). No holding of this Court required the [Wisconsin] Court of Appeal[s] to apply the test of [*Cronic*] to the [defense attorney's] conduct here. Therefore, the state court's decision was not contrary to or an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law."

Despite the limited circumstances under which a federal court can permissibly grant habeas relief under the AEDPA, and despite *Musladin*'s reiteration that federal courts must strictly interpret those standards for the presumptive benefit of a State court's adjudication, the Seventh Circuit opted to go its own way. The Seventh Circuit's violation of those standards requires this Court's review and correction.

II. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE AEDPA'S STANDARDS FOR REVIEWING A STATE COURT'S ADJUDICATION IN A CRIMINAL CASE.

In asserting that "[t]he Seventh Circuit's decision does not conflict with decisions of this Court in respect to the standard to be applied to right-to-counsel cases in plea hearings" (Br. in Opp. 21), Van Patten addresses the wrong issue. The AEDPA standards concern not whether a lower federal court's decision conflicts with this Court's decisions, but whether a State court's adjudication "resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by" this Court. Unless a "holding of this Court required" the Wisconsin Court of Appeals to apply *Cronic* rather than *Strickland* to Van Patten's ineffective-assistance claim, "the state court's decision was not contrary to or an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law." *Musladin*, 127 S. Ct. at 654.

Here, none of this Court's holdings required the Wisconsin state courts to apply *Cronic*. *Cronic* "clearly establishe[s]" an irrebuttable presumption of prejudice where an actual or constructive denial of counsel occurs. But *Cronic* does not hold, or provide any basis for holding, that telephonic assistance equates with a "complete denial of counsel." *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 659. Nor does *Cronic* hold, or provide any basis for holding, that an attorney providing actively engaged assistance via a telephonic connection during a change-of-plea hearing equates with counsel "entirely fail[ing] to subject the prosecution's case to meaningful adversarial testing." *Id.*[2]

Cronic also does not hold, and does not provide any basis for holding, that in Van Patten's circumstances, the "likelihood that any lawyer, even a fully competent one, could provide effective assistance is so small that a presumption of prejudice is appropriate without inquiry into

---

[2] In *Strickland*, Justice Brennan illustrated this "potted plant" scenario by citing a Ninth Circuit case in which defense counsel slept, dozed, or otherwise lacked alertness during substantial portions of the trial. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 703 n.2 (1984) (Brennan, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (citing *Javor v. United States*, 724 F.2d 831, 834 (9th Cir. 1984)). Nothing like that occurred in this case.

Moreover, in a change-of-plea context, the adversarial-testing criterion does not assist a court in determining whether counsel provided ineffective assistance at the hearing, regardless of whether counsel appeared in person or via a telephonic connection. Adversarial testing does not occur at a change-of-plea hearing. Rather, adversarial testing occurs earlier, when defense counsel ponders both the prosecutor's case and the defendant's countervailing case, when the defendant and defense counsel together evaluate the State's case as they balance the risks and benefits of a trial versus a plea, and when the prosecutor and defense counsel negotiate the terms of a plea.

the actual conduct of the trial." *Id.* at 659-60. *Powell v. Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45 (1932), and the "constructive denial" cases cited in *Cronic* uniformly involve State procedural rules and judicial actions that actively erected barriers preventing counsel from providing effective assistance. *Cronic*, 466 U.S. at 659 n.25. By contrast, in Van Patten's case, the trial court acted to effect assistance by Van Patten's counsel. None of this Court's holdings required the Wisconsin state courts to apply *Cronic* when the trial court facilitated rather than obstructed defense counsel's assistance — a distinction further emphasizing the Seventh Circuit's failure to follow *Musladin*'s requirement that federal courts in habeas proceedings carefully categorize the circumstances of the case.

Beyond addressing the wrong issue, Van Patten's objection suffers from at least three fundamental flaws. First, the Seventh Circuit's characterization of the circumstances at the plea hearing (and Van Patten's echo of that characterization (Br. in Opp. 25)) do not accurately reflect the record. The petition identifies the serious defects in the Seventh Circuit's characterization (Pet. 24-27). Van Patten's reiteration neither decreases the Seventh Circuit's original inaccuracies nor requires response beyond the recitation found in the petition.

Second, Van Patten claimed a discrete, readily identifiable, and easily reviewable claim of error in his counsel's representation, not an allegedly pervasive structural error. At the plea-withdrawal hearing, Van Patten testified he would not have entered his no-contest plea "if [his] attorney, Mr. Connell, had been present there" at the plea hearing (Answer to Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Ex. J, at 13). In the Wisconsin courts, he did not assert that his lawyer's telephonic assistance had caused him any other prejudice. Van Patten's claim thus suits *Strickland*'s two-part test rather than *Cronic*'s one-part test.

Third, Van Patten, like the Seventh Circuit, continues to ignore the flagrant and irreconcilable contradiction at

the core of his ineffective-assistance claim (Pet. 8 (reviewing Van Patten's testimony); Pet. 27 (summarizing the contradiction)). By itself, this contradiction should have precluded habeas relief under the AEDPA: to petitioner's knowledge, this Court has never held that counsel's conduct can even qualify as deficient performance when that conduct makes it easier rather than more difficult for a defendant to engage in his preferred action, much less qualify as deficient performance so severe the defendant need not prove consequent prejudice. In addition, the contradiction highlights again the Seventh Circuit's failure, despite *Musladin*'s admonition, to closely scrutinize and then properly classify Van Patten's claim.

III. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT FAILED TO ACCORD AEDPA DEFERENCE TO THE FACTS FOUND IN THE WISCONSIN STATE COURTS.

In defending the Seventh Circuit's recitation of facts on which the court predicated its holding that *Cronic* rather than *Strickland* applied to his ineffective-assistance claim, Van Patten argues, essentially, that because *Cronic* applied, the Seventh Circuit's facts did not violate a federal court's obligation to grant deference to State courts' findings of fact (Br. in Opp. 27-29). Van Patten's argument, however, ignores the Seventh Circuit's explanation for its fact-finding: "In deciding whether to dispense with the two-part *Strickland* inquiry, a court must evaluate whether the 'surrounding circumstances make it unlikely that the defendant could have received the effective assistance of counsel'" (Pet. App. A17). The Seventh Circuit discussed its selected facts in order to determine whether *Cronic* applied, not (as Van Patten argues) because *Cronic* applied.

In selecting those facts, the Seventh Circuit had a clear obligation under the AEDPA to defer to facts found

by a State court, 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1), and, concomitantly, not to rely on facts resting on "a set of debatable inferences," *Collins*, 546 U.S. at 342. The petition shows that the Seventh Circuit did neither.

For example, Van Patten professes puzzlement about "debatable inferences" by the Seventh Circuit (Br. in Opp. 29). But as the petition noted, when the Seventh Circuit wrote that "[i]f Van Patten wished to converse with his attorney, anyone else in the courtroom could effectively eavesdrop" (Pet. App. A18), the court drew an inference "directly contradict[ing] Van Patten's own understanding of the circumstances at the plea hearing: during his testimony at the plea-withdrawal hearing, Van Patten concurred that the trial judge had advised that 'if [he] wanted to talk to [his] attorney, if [he] had any questions, that they would set up a private place for [him] to talk' (Ex. J at 17)" (Pet. 26). A federal habeas court's declaration of a fact directly contrary to the habeas petitioner's uncontradicted against-interest statement of a fact all but defines a "debatable inference."

Likewise, when the Seventh Circuit wrote that "we cannot know what Van Patten might have done had he been treated like any other defendant with counsel at his side" (Pet. App. A19), the Seventh Circuit repudiated the Wisconsin trial court's disbelief in Van Patten's credibility. Rejecting Van Patten's contention, the Wisconsin trial court explicitly found that defense counsel did not coerce Van Patten (Pet. App. A54 ("you were not coerced into doing this")). The Wisconsin court dismissed Van Patten's credibility with the declaration that "you agreed to do what the record reflects you did; and I believe that everything that we heard since then is because you didn't like getting 25 years" (Pet. App. A55) -- a credibility determination rejecting any truth in Van Patten's self-serving testimony that he would have refrained from entering his no-contest plea if defense counsel had stood in court with him.

In addition, the Seventh Circuit disregarded the glaring factual and logical contradiction in Van Patten's claim — an irreconcilable contradiction noted by the Wisconsin trial court and that underlay the court's conclusion that Van Patten would have tendered his no-contest plea even if his attorney had assisted him in person rather than via a telephonic connection.

Thus, contrary to Van Patten's contention, the Seventh Circuit substituted, at critical points, its factual conclusions for those of the Wisconsin state courts and evoked facts from "debatable inferences." The Seventh Circuit then based its decision on those improperly substituted facts. In doing so, the Seventh Circuit again violated the strictures of the AEDPA. That violation requires review and repudiation.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, as well as those in the petition, the Court should grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

J.B. VAN HOLLEN
Attorney General of Wisconsin

CHRISTOPHER G. WREN
Assistant Attorney General
Counsel of Record
Attorneys for Petitioner
Randall Wright

Wisconsin Department of Justice
Post Office Box 7857
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857
(608) 266-7081

October 30, 2007.